

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ADMIRERS of Dr. William Adams BROWN (and they are many, and in all the churches) will welcome another volume from his busy pen. It bears the title, *The Minister: His World and His Work* (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; \$2.00), and is described in the sub-title as 'a study of some pressing tasks and problems of present-day Protestantism.' In effect it is a significant and timely contribution to the literature of Practical Theology.

We commend, especially to ministers of religion, the chapters on the Minister as Priest, the Minister as Evangelist, the Minister as Teacher, the Minister as Pastor, and the Minister as Churchman. In all these chapters the author says informative and useful things out of the fullness of his learning and experience. But we would here direct the attention of our readers in particular to a chapter in the earlier part of the work in which the author seeks to fortify ministers in the face of a certain modern challenge to faith.

The belief in God is nowadays challenged on two main grounds. It is challenged on intellectual grounds by scientists who tell us that the God whom religion offers us is not real. It is challenged even more directly on moral grounds by reformers who assure us that the God whom religion offers us is not good. The scientist's substitute for God is Nature; the reformer's—or moralist's, or humanist's—substitute is Man.

It is the chapter in which the humanist's substitute for God is discussed which we would now present in outline. The humanist sees in religious belief not the chief motive for service to man, but an obstacle to human progress; and, as a working substitute for the faith he would have us discard, he would ask us to turn to man and in the service of man to find a sufficient object for devotion.

As for the form this devotion to man should take, it should either be individual self-development, self-realization, self-expression, or the endeavour after the good of society. Some humanists emphasize the first alternative, others the second.

But the philosophy of self-expression as a substitute for God carries with it certain difficulties. One is that the attempt of an individual to express himself may bring him into conflict with other individuals similarly seeking self-expression. Another, and even more serious, difficulty is that the desire of each individual is subject to change with advancing years. But the fundamental difficulty is that there is no such thing as an isolated individual. Man realizes himself only through relation to other persons or to that system of collective relationships known by such terms as family, class, or nation.

But in recent years we have been hearing less of the philosophy of self-expression, and more of the second substitute for God presented to us by our

contemporary humanists—devotion to the social good. Man as an individual they would replace by mankind as a whole, but not the humanity of to-day with its imperfections, but the perfected humanity of the future—perfected through the new knowledge which science will increasingly bring.

When we ask how this ideal society is to be reached, we find the ways parting. Some humanists advocate the way of reconstruction, others that of revolution. Those who take the first view—Bernard Shaw, for example—are inclined to be conservative in their attitude toward existing social institutions, many even to the social institution of the Church. Those who take the second view—the Communists of contemporary Russia, for example—tolerate no attempt to remodel old institutions like the Church or to redefine old terms like the word God. They would break completely with an error so deep-seated and long-continued as belief in God.

‘It is the view taken of the State which differentiates the Communistic philosophy from that of contemporary Nationalism in its Fascist form. Both alike magnify the State as having the right to the loyalty and devotion of all its citizens. But to the Fascist, whether he be Italian or National Socialist, loyalty to the State is justified as inherently excellent, the normal expression of man’s highest aspiration; whereas to the Communist this devotion is regarded as a temporary expedient, necessary to be sure, because of the fact of the class war, but at its best only a stage through which the Communist movement must pass on to its ultimate goal, the universal rule of the proletariat in a world from which all classes have disappeared.’

What should be the Christian attitude towards humanism? With what spirit should the Christian meet its challenge? He should sympathize with the movement in so far as it is a protest against evils for which he himself is partly to blame. He should also recognize that it stands for three great convictions, which Christians can share: the value of man as man, a truth which Jesus Christ Himself affirmed; the competency of man, his ability to become what he ought to be—but in dependence,

says the theist, not upon Nature but upon God; the responsibility of man for making use of his power to change the world for the better. Pride and selfishness alone cannot explain the rise and extraordinary vitality of these new religions—Communism, Fascism, National Socialism. Something larger and nobler is involved, something that appeals to loyalty and justifies sacrifice.

But while within the individual nation the sovereignty of the State is the condition of all ordered and stable life, in the world of nations the assertion of unrestricted national sovereignty threatens mankind with anarchy. This is the situation which we face to-day. And Dr. Adams BROWN concludes that against such a misguided loyalty the one defence is a higher loyalty—loyalty to the God who has made of one blood all the members of the human race, and that the one institution which exists to remind men of this fact and to summon them to this highest allegiance is the Christian Church.

Friedrich HEILER’s *Das Gebet*, published a few months before the end of the World War, has become a standard book on prayer. It was translated (with the omission of certain sections, and of much of the illustrative material) into English in 1932 by Samuel M’Comb with the assistance of J. Edgar Park—*Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion*—and published by the Oxford University Press. And now it has been reissued in the series, ‘The Oxford Bookshelf,’ at the very moderate price of 6s. net.

It will serve to call attention to this reissue of so important and useful a book if we analyse for our readers one of its discussions. Let us take the discussion in the last chapter on ‘The Essence of Prayer.’

HEILER begins by reminding us of the astonishing multiplicity of forms in which prayer appears in history. He gives what seems to be a fairly exhaustive list of them, and then proceeds to ask:



What is common to all these diverse kinds of prayer, what underlies all these phenomenal forms, in a word, what is the essence of prayer?

If we would understand the essence of prayer we must separate the primary from the secondary types and concentrate upon the former. The primary types are the naïve prayer of primitive man, the devotional life of men of religious genius, the prayers of great men, the common prayer of public worship in so far as it has not hardened into stiff, conventional forms. In all these instances prayer appears to be an immediate expression, bursting forth with native energy, of an original and profound experience of the soul.

Fixing our attention, then, on prayer in its primary simplicity, we must first of all discover the essential motive of prayer, its common psychological root. What moves men to pray? It is the effort to fortify, to enhance life. 'The hungry pygmy who begs for food, the entranced mystic, absorbed in the greatness and beauty of the infinite God, the guilt-oppressed Christian who prays for forgiveness of sins and assurance of salvation—all are seeking life; they seek a confirmation and an enrichment of their realization of life. Even the Buddhist beggar-monk, who by meditation works himself up into a state of perfect indifference, seeks in the denial of life to attain a higher and purer life.'

But the peculiar essence of prayer is still to be discovered. There are three elements which form the inner structure of the prayer-experience: (1) faith in a living personal God, (2) faith in His real, immediate presence, and (3) a realistic fellowship into which man enters with a God conceived as present.

The first two elements, belief in God's personality and the assurance of His presence, are the two pre-suppositions of prayer. But prayer itself is no mere belief in the reality of a personal God—such a belief underlies even a theistic metaphysic; nor is it a mere experience of His presence—for this is the accompaniment of the entire life and thought of the great men of religion. Prayer is rather a living

relation of man to God, a direct and inner contact, a spiritual commerce, a communion, a union of an 'I' and a 'Thou.'

As anthropomorphism is only a crude form of belief in the personality of God, so belief in the real influence of prayer on the divine will is only a crude form of vital intercourse with God. It does not belong to the essence of prayer. The miracle of prayer does not lie in the influence of man upon God, but in the mysterious contact between man and God established by prayer.

The living communion of the religious man with God in which the essence of prayer consists—with God conceived as personal and present in experience, is only imperfectly realized in the subordinate types of prayer: in liturgical prayer, in the philosophical ideal of prayer, and in certain forms of mystical communion. To pray means to speak to, and have intercourse with God, as suppliant with judge, servant with master, child with father, bride with bridegroom. But the tendency in the subordinate types of prayer is to substitute adoration and devotion for genuine prayer.

'As the mysterious linking of man with the Eternal, prayer is an incomprehensible wonder, a miracle of miracles which is daily brought to pass in the devout soul. The historian and psychologist of religion can only be a spectator and interpreter of that deep and powerful life which is unveiled in prayer: only the religious man can penetrate the mystery.'

In his brilliant *Life of Jesus*, reviewed last month, the Rev. Conrad NOEL is urgently concerned with what Jesus meant by the 'Kingdom of God.' He devotes a chapter and a long appendix to the subject. In the former he expounds the *ἐντός ὑμῶν* of Lk 17<sup>21</sup>, and in the latter *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*. Mr. NOEL is certain that Jesus was proclaiming the immediate advent of a new world, a commonwealth of justice and love. You do not need, He says to the Pharisees, to strain your eyes, looking for any conventional sign of the Kingdom, for it is here already



in My own person and in the little community around Me.

That is the devious meaning of ἐντός ὑμῶν. The Kingdom is in the midst of you. The conventional interpretation, 'within you,' in spite of Canon Streeter, will not do. This is 'the usual theme of the popular preacher,' but the context of the passage in Luke is against it. Most scholars agree in this conclusion. The Greek can bear either meaning, 'within' or 'among,' and in such a case the context must decide. It was the Pharisees who asked the question, *when* the Kingdom would come. Is it conceivable that Jesus would say to *them*, 'the Kingdom of God is within you'? They wanted signs, and Jesus replied that the real signs of the Kingdom were such as they could not understand or value. The signs were already given in His ministry. The Kingdom is not 'here' or 'there.' It is already thundering at your doors.

Those who believe in the Kingdom as within the heart and its coming as a gradual spread from heart to heart are convinced that there will be nothing startling or apocalyptic about it, 'nothing ungentlemanly in its coming.' They are anxious to prove this from the New Testament, partly because they have the timid bourgeois mentality which cannot bear anything so unpleasant or disturbing as a crash, and partly (among other reasons) because they do not feel the horror of the system under which their poorer neighbours groan. They think they do, but there is ample proof that they do not understand in the least. Therefore they say the world is good, doubtless there are serious faults, and the whole apocalyptic assumption they dismiss as Manichean and false to the facts. So Mr. NOEL.

And so much for 'within or among.' The Kingdom is not an inner spiritual reality but a new community, already present in Jesus and His disciples. But what of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ? It is tolerably clear, says Mr. NOEL, that the common people generally would have understood the phrase as describing a tangible commonwealth that was coming here on this earth, and that therefore no teacher who used the phrase would have expected the peasants,

artisans, craftsmen, to have understood anything different by it. If Jesus had meant something different He would have explained such a departure from the current popular belief.

Further, the current literature which created prevailing conceptions speaks of the expected commonwealth as a kingdom that is coming on this earth. Some of the Psalms of Solomon, for example, ring with this hope of a Utopia of justice and mercy. So the Book of Enoch, and generally almost all contemporary literature. The Kingdom is outward and political, in the true sense of political, public. Mr. NOEL's point is apparently that Jesus would naturally use the term in the same sense. But (though we are expounding Mr. NOEL not criticising him) a caveat may be briefly stated at this point. It must not be forgotten that it was this very traditional hope of Israel that Jesus rejected in His wilderness temptation. He felt its appeal, but finally broke with it.

But Mr. NOEL goes on to grapple with βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Is it 'reign' or 'commonwealth'? There are those who maintain that it can mean nothing but 'reign.' But Mr. NOEL contends that only a study of the leading motifs of the Old Testament can decide. Community is the keynote of the Old Testament. Even the 'I' of the Psalms and Prophets generally refers to the nation. The religion of the Old Testament may be summed up in Jeremiah's phrase, 'they shall be my people, and I will be their God.' If, then, the main theme of the Gospels is God's majesty, sovereignty, or reign, it is odd that the rock from which the New Testament was hewn is this rock of community, and that the very first interpretation of what Jesus meant should again be in terms of community, and not merely of the individual soul. It might, perhaps, be suggested to Mr. NOEL that the infinite value of the individual soul was just the supreme truth about man that Jesus asserted.

It seems clear, to continue Mr. NOEL's argument, that βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ may mean either reign or commonwealth. Its predominant meaning is sovereignty, according to A. C. Headlam, but he finds in

it also the idea of an universal people acknowledging God's rule. And even the late Canon Streeter, who held that ἐντός ὑμῶν can only mean 'within you,' spoke of our Lord's conception as including the idea of a corporate national regeneration of this earth. The conclusion of scholars seems to be that our Lord's use of 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' will include the idea of community, and that such an idea is compatible with the use of the Greek phrase as current in His times.

Mr. NOEL goes on to examine the text of the Gospels themselves, and their evidence on the main question. He admits that many of the parables suggest God reigning, though he does not deal with the parables that emphasize most strongly the idea of spiritual inner experience, those of the leaven and mustard seed. But he has no difficulty in finding many passages that cannot very well bear any other meaning than that of a renewed community. And towards the end of his essay Mr. NOEL seems to reach a conclusion which common sense will regard as harmonizing both views, outer and inner.

'Even if "within you" be the right rendering,' he says, 'there need be no contradiction, for the ideal of a commonwealth, in which God's own justice and mercy should be made paramount, must first be an idea within the heart—not only in God's heart, but in many hearts inspired by Him—before

it becomes actualized and takes shape and dwells among us. Socialism is a collective idea, but it is first the dream of many hearts for which they will give their lives. . . . Home Rule was the dream held sacred within the hearts of many Irish folk. If it had not been within them, it would never have been realized "without" in the outside world of affairs. So that even if "within you" be the correct interpretation, there is here no contradiction.'

And Mr. NOEL concludes: 'People may say, what, after all, is the difference? Is this not only another controversy between theorists? What practical effect can it have on life? Reign or commonwealth—what does it matter? Do not many of the advocates hold that if individual after individual accepted God as the ruler of his life, events of a world-shaking nature would be bound to happen? Would not the very face of the world be changed? Is it not, after all, by the conversion of the individual to God that the world will at last be redeemed?' Mr. NOEL thinks there is real and vital importance in his insistence on community as prominent in the mind of Jesus. For sheer religious individualism, and the conception of religion as a purely interior affair, carry in them serious dangers. It is urgent for us to realize that Jesus meant to change *this world*, and change it so radically that God's justice would, and will, prevail over the individualism that keeps so many of our neighbours from the life God designed them to have.

## The Basis of Worship.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID H. HISLOP, D.D., ARDWELL, STRANRAER.

ONE characteristic of the age in which we live is a great interest in, if not a heightened sense of, worship. This may arise in part from a leading trait of our era that it is religious though obviously not Christian. For to-day there is the tendency for every one to turn his attitude to life, be it political or scientific, æsthetic or moral, into a religion which dominates his life, thrills his heart, and claims his obedience and allegiance. The atmosphere of this

time is one in which men bend their views and thoughts to the demands of a mystical intuition, for not alone in Russia or in Germany does every appeal of politics, art, or science engage those dispositions which are primarily religious in their nature. It is thus not unimportant that men's thoughts should be directed to that act of the soul in which the religious spirit finds expression.

Alongside this temper of to-day there is also found



in certain quarters a mood, engendered by the study of comparative religion which evaporates the sense of worship into something else, and by equating the values in all religious experience from the earliest times, reduces worship to the expression of some psychological need in man's nature. Worship can then become nothing more than a contrivance to overcome some inner difficulty which man can outgrow in his development. Worship, individual or collective, appears but as a relic of the past, and the need which once it met is now satisfied by other activities of the mind. But such a purely humanistic standpoint surely puts the cart before the horse. Little or nothing is explained in the worship of developed religion by pointing to its supposed origin. But perchance a light may fall—even on what seems but a groping superstition in the darkness, if the impulse that lay behind is seen in the light of a higher revelation.

Thus at the outset it is imperative to insist that worship, as seen in the light of the Christian revelation, is no ingenious discovery of the human spirit; it is the response of man to the revelation of God. Worship is the answer of man's spirit to the revealed Word; thus worship implies faith, and faith is not the consequence of man's struggle, but the gift of God. The word of the Psalmist gives the profound analysis of worship: 'Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek.' The initiative comes from God. God's hand reaches forth and man's spirit is awakened. This is axiomatic of all worship. God acts: He reveals His glory, His loving-kindness, His grace, His purity, and the purposes of His Kingdom. His spirit touches the soul and the soul expresses its adoration, its thanksgiving, its penitence, its intercession. The basis of worship in its ultimate sense rests on God's revelation. It is surely wiser and more in accord with truth to interpret the impulses of the lower religions in obedience to this postulate of Christian worship than to infringe the inviolate fact that worship is from the hand of God. Christian worship certainly has this definitive basis. God the Father reveals through creation and in redemption the Eternal Word, and the worshipper through Christ and in the Spirit worships. Thus worship can never be a work of merit, for in the deepest sense it is God's Spirit that creates the desire and makes the response to His grace and glory.

This insistence on the primary action of God's Spirit in worship does not involve that the Spirit does not use means. As Berdyaev says in another connexion: 'In the spiritual life there is no distinction and opposition between ends and means.' The fact

that the Spirit acts through the constitution of human nature means that a psychological account can be given of this action. Most psychologists deny that there is any special religious instinct at the basis of worship and resolve this instinct into primary emotions. The sense of submission and wonder when united give rise to admiration, and when fear blends with admiration there is awe, and when the feeling of tenderness is linked to awe there is reverence. Otto, as some others, finds the sense of the Holy as primary. But this question need not detain us. At its best such a psychological analysis gives only the ingredients of devotion, the bricks not the design of the architecture, the raw emotion not its significant form and meaning.

However we account for the development of the instinct to worship, it is deeply rooted in man's life, and must be regarded from the standpoint of the Christian faith as a basal fact of human nature. Nor does the experience of the seemingly non-religious, or those who would describe themselves as such, refute this statement. That a man has no appetite for wholesome food is no contradiction of the fact that food is necessary to the human body. It may mean that he is sick. Again, not a few of the extravagant follies of mankind appear to be the misuse of this worshipping attitude, whereby a man devotes himself to what seems greater than himself. And it is most apparent that the attitude of will which is fitting to the Creator is not only unfitting but ethically disastrous when given to any creature. Further, there are sins of flesh as well as of spirit which testify to the clamant need that man must lose, though but for a brief moment, the sense of his restless and unsatisfied self. Nor do the testimonies of noble spirits who have walked the way of the agnostic contradict this statement. Witness is borne to this universal craving by the noble stoicism of such a verse:

Be still, be still my soul; it is but for a season  
Let us endure an hour and see injustice done.<sup>1</sup>

Or in such words written by one who professed no belief in God:

I spake to the sea. I desired to have its strength,  
its mystery and its glory.<sup>2</sup>

From the viewpoint of Christian worship we must recognize the existence of these emotions of resignation and of adoration which are not conscious of their own witness. The fact that worship is an essential activity of man's spiritual nature, as eating is of his bodily nature, makes wide the horizon of

<sup>1</sup> A. E. Housman.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Jefferies.



Christian worship. For then worship is no cloistered corner of the soul, but is the expression in conscious form of what lies in the heart of mankind. Man, says the Hebrew story, was made in the image of God and what lies in the deeps of this strange nature of ours is the imprisoned spirit. Worship in its widest sense includes the insight and rapture of the poet's dream and the vision and form of the artist's imagination. These things belong to adoration: they are the unconscious witness of God's presence. Worship in its definite sense is the conscious direction of these emotions and capacities to the Eternal God, and Christian worship is this direction to God through Christ in the Spirit.

From this it follows that worship is no accidental thing. It is an essential element in the rhythm of mortal existence. Worship is not the whole of life, for our days are divided into many hours and our existence embraces many interests and emotions. Into each fragment of life the activity of the soul goes: to work, recreation, the life of the body, eating and drinking, exercise, the life of the mind, art, music, literature. Yet each of these however engrossing is but partial, and however insistent its claims, is not universal. There is an attitude of the soul not to a part of life but to the whole, and that attitude is the attitude of worship. For man's attitude to the whole of existence is his attitude to God. This belongs to the ebb and flow of mortal living. For the soul must return from the distraction of its many interests and from the exhaustion of its many tasks to seek renewal at the fountain-head of life and energy. An old Christian hymn makes this invocation: 'O God the persistent energy of things' (*Deus rerum tenax vigor*). As sleep refreshes and as food restores, so worship renews the energy dissipated by living and spent in activity. 'My soul he does restore again' is a plain statement that worship is a necessary part of man's life. In another respect worship belongs to the cycle of living. 'Our little life is rounded with a sleep'; and in the twilight the values of life grow uncertain, and in the shadow its joys seem unreal. To find a meaning in the medley of existence and to know in the soul that life is the good thing which blind instinct in its groping feels, man must see life as a whole; he must be lifted above the hazard and the harass of time's happenings into the peace of the Eternal. The necessity of worship is the need for security in this perilous existence when all we are and all we value seem at times to be at the mercy of death's relentless stroke or life's withering breath. These two needs of man—renewal and security—find their satisfaction in

worship, because worship is the attitude of the soul to the whole—to God.

This attitude of worship is communion with a Power that is other than ourselves. Over against man stands the Other. The character of our worship depends on the Being with whom we have communion. In his worship, man's nature needs two things—the Ultimate and the Intimate. The religions of history have not seldom separated these two needs. The Divine Being worshipped has been remote beyond the reach of man's piteous appeal, or so close to man's life that the Divine shared in the vicissitude of time and was partaker of mortal weakness and failure. The Ultimate was inaccessible and the Intimate was so merged in the mortal that the Divine became the ideal reflection of man's own life. But worship calls for the Absolute beyond whom there is none other. Not like the Greek pantheon with Necessity beyond, nor like Setebos with the 'Quiet' overhead. Worship calls also for the Intimate: 'closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.' Not like the Immanent Will of Hardy's *Dynasts* 'past the sense of kindly-eyed benevolence,' nor like the Deity of Carlyle who does nothing. It is in the Incarnation that this twin demand of worship is met, and through the Christian doctrine of the Trinity—the Eternal Father, God the Creator, the Eternal Son, God the Reconciler, the Eternal Spirit, God the Deliverer who sets free—the Ultimate and the Intimate meet. The God in whom we live and move and have our being, the Word who was made flesh and dwelt among us, the Spirit who maketh intercession.

Thus the faith that is expressed in Christian worship is faith in God—transcendent and immanent. To separate these moments of thought in worship leaves us either with the abyss of the Divine of whom nothing is known for nought is revealed, or with the Divine as the embodiment of human aspiration. It follows then that God's unlikeness to man as well as God's likeness to man come into worship. For man is a creature infinitely removed from the Creator, and the sense of this absolute difference is essential to the worship of the Almighty and All Holy; but man is also a creature made in the image of God, and by his vision of ethical purity and through his human love he finds an interpretation of God's goodness and of God's loving-kindness. This interpretation is made assured in the revelation in Jesus, whose constant name for God was Father, and in the incarnation within our little life of that Spirit who redeems the life of man from sin and self-despising. The soul in worship



is ever in a holy place wherein there is no familiarity, for the intimacy of God in redemption is redeeming because it is God the Infinite who redeems. 'Love and Dread,' says Juliana of Norwich, 'are brethren'; and awe and love are blended in worship as man is in the presence of God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, and of Jesus Christ, who for us men and our salvation was incarnate, lived and suffered and conquered.

Worship has thus these three aspects: the feeling and the awareness of the Divine, the expression and affirmation of faith, the communion with God's Will. It is therefore not one part but the whole of man's nature that is involved in this experience. The emotions of the heart are there, for to worship is something other than to think. Feeling envelops the beliefs of the worshipper, changing them from abstraction into vital things. Feeling also surrounds the submission of the will. Communion with the Divine gives rise to emotions of love and reverence, but these emotions are also the means by which the worshipper knows that he is in the presence of God. The Will is active in worship, for man's will is directed to God as the prelude to worship, and man's will seeks obedience to God's Will as the fruit of worship. Communion with God is the laying of our wills beneath God's Will. The activity of thought is present in intuition and in interpretation. In worship there is the intuitive sense of God's Presence, vague or definite, the sense of a Veiled Presence or a definitely conceived Personality. Also there is the endeavour to interpret this experience of communion and to express this faith. On the level of conscious life, feeling, will, and thought are involved.

But in addition to this, worship is also concerned with what does not fall directly within the focus of consciousness. It is obvious how associations count here. Associations, of which we are not aware, linked to the sound of words or to the sight of objects are frequently most potent factors in our worship. Words like the Lord's Prayer or the Te Deum, objects as the Holy Table, or the Bread and the Wine of the Sacrament, have in them the sense of the numinous. Associations that have little or nothing to do with their meanings are linked to hymns and to texts of Scripture. In yet more subtle ways the subconscious mind plays its part in this experience. In worship the primitive feelings are sublimated, to use the language of psychology, or, to use the language of religion, the Spirit of Christ makes use of these caged instincts and primitive feelings that have been repressed by moral

standards, and these are delivered from their bondage and find relief in praise and exultation.

The subconscious enters into all worship, be it private devotion or the public service. Its effect, however, is more potent in public worship, for the presence of other worshippers impinges on our conscious and subconscious mind. 'It does not help me,' wrote Matthew Arnold, 'to think a thing more clearly that thousands of other people are thinking the same, but it does help me to worship with more emotion that thousands of people are worshipping with me.' This characteristic utterance of Arnold is true so far as it goes, though perhaps it does not take us very far. It is a truism to say that men act differently in a crowd from what they would do as individuals. The temper of the crowd is more emotional than that of any individual in it. This is so in the first place, because the individual loses something of his self-consciousness, and this blurs his sense of responsibility; and in the second place, because the individual becomes more suggestible and this makes him more readily adopt a course of action or a way of thought. These qualities in themselves are not good things for they may mean that a crowd is capable of unbridled passion or of fanatical prejudice. But this influence of others upon the individual does provide in public worship an avenue for the action of the Spirit. Contact with others helps to overcome that consciousness of self which is so grievous an obstacle to communion with God, and the influence of others makes more pliant man's mind to the reception of new impulses and fresh aspirations. The worshipper at a public service by reason of the contact of other minds upon his subconscious mind possesses a receptivity that would be hard to obtain otherwise. It may be true that what is new and original is oftenest born in the silent stillness of the solitary place, but it is not always so. Certainly it is through the practice of public worship that a new light can fall upon the familiar, and the ordinary happenings of every day are invested with a glory not of this world. From the constitution of man's mind it would seem then that a greater receptivity and a keener sensitiveness are possible in public worship than in private devotion.

Till now I have spoken of the psychological aspect of worship as an inner experience, but by its very nature the spirit of worship must seek an external expression. It is a condition of man's existence that the inner impulse or mood only becomes our own in the act of expression. As one surveys as things apart the various forms the spirit of worship has taken, they seem dull and dead, like



the seaweed left on the beach by the ebbing tide. To worship in spirit and in truth, it has been argued, is to dispense with all the external expression of worship. Certainly the embodiment of the spirit of worship does give it definiteness. But this definiteness is a corollary of revelation. Worship is not an emotional haze before the Infinite : it is the response of a creature to the definite revelation of an Infinite Being—a response of joy and reverence before the glory, of awe before the mystery, of adoring gratitude before the wondrous grace of God's love and redemption. An artist's dream is vague, haunting, and illusive until the dream has found embodiment in colour and line. So the soul of the worshipper demands definite expression for the mood of worship. This applies to private devotion, for if the practice of meditation or the contemplative prayer be more than thinking or reverie, it is because our mood finds expression in the case of meditation in new resolves, fresh lessons, and direct aspirations, and in the case of contemplation, because our mood finds fulfilment in the direct communion of the soul with God.

Yet far more apparent is this need for expression in public worship, for there must be a common utterance of devotion that links through the meaning of word, the significance of action, the associations of sound and of sight, one worshipper with another. Thus worship as an inner experience implies the use in the public service of things belonging to the world of sense in which are incarnate the soaring aspiration and the offering of the soul's devotion. Perchance the worshipper is prone at times to feel in the public service that the adoration far transcends his feelings, that the confession of penitence exaggerates his sense of sinfulness, that the resounding praise is beyond his somewhat limited sense of gratitude. That doubtless is so, for few there be that can claim the soaring vision of the prophet or the adoring joy of the saint, and so many of us come to the service with minds but half withdrawn from 'the busy trade of life.' But let us bear in mind that the public service is not only the expression of our spiritual mood. It certainly ought to be the offering of our high thanksgiving, deepest longing, and our surrendered wills, but it is more. The service ought to be not only the expression of our inner life but the suggestion of the Presence of God and of Christ. Thus language that seems scarce fitting for our little souls is yet the only fitting language in the presence of our Divine Lord and Master. Just as we turn to the great poetry of the world in our mood of love or of sorrow and find an utterance beyond our highest effort, so in the sphere of worship we find the voice of prophetic inspira-

tion and the vision of the saint. This does more than express our mood : it suggests heights we have not trod and depths we have not fathomed. Not for us—at times we may feel these resplendent robes of the soul, but none the less our souls well know they are the fit 'garments of praise' in the presence of God's glory and exceeding grace. Thus the external means of worship are not only the expression of the soul's offering, they are also the suggestion and the shadow of the Divine Presence.

While it is true that God is always the initiator of worship, for as Jacopone da Todi says : 'Thou art the Love with which the heart loves Thee,' it is also true that God initiates the act of worship in two ways. There are two psychological movements at the basis of worship we may say, if we choose to use such language. It may be that it is but two standpoints, but this gives rise to two figures or shapes in worship. The one may be termed the soul's ascent, the other may be called the spirit's descent. Historically the distinction is seen between the type of religion which emphasizes the aspiration of the soul to God, and this is 'mystical' in character, and the type of religion which dwells on God's approach to man, and this is 'prophetic' in character. Psychologically the difference is between the consciousness of the soul reaching upwards to God and the consciousness of the soul receiving from God. Of course both of these figures within the ambit of the Christian revelation acknowledge that God's hand directs. In the former case, the soul's seeking is in response to God's call ; in the latter, the soul is quiescent before God's revelation. The former brings into special prominence the aspect of God's Being, the mystery of His glory, and the wonder of His Grace ; the latter stresses the power of God, His action in creation and redemption.

There are therefore two figures or shapes in accordance with these two aspects, and both belong to the heritage of the Christian faith. The former has its highest point in adoration where the sense of self is lost in the contemplation of God's glory and grace. It passes through the recognized stages of purgation, illumination, to unity. The soul by confession before God is cleansed by His forgiveness, enlightened by God's truth, and finally is united in adoration, and in the ocean of God's fullness the cramping sense of self vanishes. The second figure of worship has its most profound moment in the awe of the creature before the Creator, the wonder of the redeemed before the Deliverer. In the confession of man's creatureliness the sense of Divine Majesty dominates all, but



though the self is as nothing before the face of the Eternal and the littleness of man who is but as a breath is made emphatic, the very fact that the worshipper is so conscious that he is a creature means that his sense of identity does not disappear. This confession of creatureliness leads on to the status given by God's grace to the creature as His child, and in the light of God's revealing truth the soul of the worshipper discovers the purposes of God's Kingdom and learns his duties in the world in which he is set. So the end of this figure of worship is a soul disciplined and equipped for the conflict. What has to be noted is that here the sense of self is not obliterated, it is affirmed. The sense of obeisance before God does not here create as does adoration the sense of unity with God, but rather makes more poignant the difference. These two fundamental patterns of worship need to be related in some order or system.

But not only has worship a figure or shape or pattern, it has also a colour or tone. 'The Eternal light of revelation,' says Karl Adam, 'is differently reflected in the prism of each age with different angles of refraction.' Not only is this so, but the light of revelation is reflected in the pieties of diverse kinds with different angles. The colour or tone of worship varies as the piety is different. This is one of the reasons that the Church has been broken into different communions. What is fundamental in worship is not to be found by ironing out all the differences and finding a lowest common denominator. Nor can we find a common basis of worship if we ignore the tones. For each form of piety expresses the basic or fundamental element in worship through its tone or colour, and so to blot that out leaves nothing worth.

What are these pieties? I am not here dealing with differences of temperament. In the spiritual realm the experience of saints shows how temperament can be transcended. These differences are familiar to any one who has dealt with the prayer life of different souls. There is an *attrait* in each spiritual experience, and the different methods of private devotion as practised (vocal prayer, meditation, affective prayer, contemplation, and mystical prayer) reveal the differences. We can distinguish

the following tones: There is objective piety which is sometimes termed ordinary piety, disciplined piety, affective or emotional piety, intellectual piety, and mystical piety. Setting aside theological differences and making a sweeping generalization, I should say that the typical Anglican and Benedictine belongs to the first, the Puritan and the Jesuit to the second, the Wesleyan and the Franciscan to the third, the Presbyterian and Dominican to the fourth, and to the fifth all those souls in all communions at every level of culture and stage of intelligence to whom has been given the mystical nature. They all have their obvious failures when the light of revelation fades and the power of the spirit fails, and may become conventional or cold or florid or arid or vague. But the basis of worship is not something that can be separated from the tones the spirit of worship has painted, and the public worship that is to be the offering and oblation of the Church and the Power and Veil of the Presence must embrace in its white light the tones of each and of all.

Worship as an offering of devotion and thanksgiving and as the surrender of man's will, means that something is done. Worship as the revelation of God's Word and Will means that something is received. Worship as fellowship means that one soul is united with the souls of other worshippers in the spirit of Christ and we are one body because Christ is the spirit of each. Worship is thus a supernatural thing. It is not simply the coming together of decent folks for their edification. It certainly should be for their good. It is not only a witness to our faith. It truly is that, and perhaps it is too little remembered that to meet for worship is to make our witness. Worship is also the offering to the Creator of the praise and thanksgiving of all creation which find in man alone its conscious voice; it is also the offering by the Church of the redeemed, of the praise and gratitude of lives delivered from fear and death's menace. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I.' The Unseen Presence amid such ordinary people, the Hidden Glory shadowed in a meeting that seems so dull and barren, the Veiled Face only to faith uncovered.



## Literature.

### MARX, FREUD, AND BUNYAN.

MR. HUCKLEBERRY FINN remarked about the *Pilgrim's Progress* that the statements in it were 'interesting but steep.' Mr. Jack Lindsay in his *John Bunyan, Maker of Myths* (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net), appears to share this profound judgment. Indeed the statements, not only in the *Pilgrim's Progress* but in *Grace Abounding* and the *Holy War*, are so steep that he has enlisted the aid of Marx and Freud to interpret them. It is true that the names of these eminent persons do not occur anywhere in the book, but their shadows are always in the background. Mr. Lindsay is convinced that, 'though formally accepted, Bunyan has never been understood,' and in this fresh biography the writer has set out to repair this omission by considering Bunyan and his statements from a new angle, with a new focus. 'The new focus is provided by the attempt to relate Bunyan's work in particular, and the Protestant movement in general, to the social forces from which they sprang.' At the same time the author has analysed the myth-making faculty in Bunyan, and tried to show how his allegories take their place in the world of symbolism and myth.

Mr. Lindsay has pictured in an arresting fashion the democratic currents of Bunyan's day and their influence on the democratic movement of our own time; and if he had presented Bunyan's life and thought on this background we should have had a significant contribution. But he has gone very much further. The struggles of Bunyan's soul were really sociological conflicts put in an 'ideological' form. It is the mesh of capitalist values in which he is caught. Selling Christ is betraying the poor. 'The poor are Christ.' The belief in 'grace' was an effort to reconcile the sufferer to a world in which capitalist values could not be evaded. The essence of the religious notion of election is to be found in the wish to submit to the blind operation of irresistible class forces. *Grace Abounding* mirrored a social crisis. The dropping of Christian's burden is the intuition of the social unity that will some day result from the throwing off of the parasite. The man with the muck-rake represents the blindly accumulating capitalist. Thus every experience of Bunyan's religious life which we have been accustomed to interpret religiously must be seen to be a kind of longing for a classless society.

Freud is not far away either. 'Underneath the

direct castration-fear of father-vengeance, the fear of the murder-phallos, there is the revolt against authority. . . .' Blasphemy is the oath-curse taking on a detached life of its own under increasing class-pressure. The 'eternal-inheritance' which Bunyan so desired is the symbol of that security which possession of the land granted. Regeneration is the abstracted form of the initiation rite. And so on.

If this is the proper way to read Bunyan he has certainly never been understood until now. What comes, however, to the reader of this biography is a complete sense of unreality. When Mr. Lindsay is writing historically he interests, and even enlightens, us. His picture of Bunyan's time is clear and impressive. But his main contention, that Bunyan was writing of the social crisis of his day in an ideological form is fantastic. The writer's attitude to religion disables him from understanding evangelical experience. It is important, he says, for the purposes of his book 'to get rid of any idea of "eternal verities" and to show the social relation of all human thinking.' Wesley, he tells us, canalized the revolutionary impulses of the masses in the eighteenth century and sent them to drain away in the arid sands of the religious abstraction. The Almighty is reduced to 'the irresistible force of human history.' It is unlikely that any one with this attitude to religion generally will understand the simple passionate spiritual history of Bunyan. Mr. Lindsay does not understand it. It was perhaps inevitable that psycho-analysis should try its prentice hand on Bunyan. The result is not convincing, even when it is largely inspired and aided by a communistic socialism. No doubt there is a social significance in *Grace Abounding* and the *Pilgrim's Progress*. But they will always remain, what they are, classics of the experience of divine grace. And, even if we do not with Mr. Bernard Shaw consider Bunyan superior to Shakespeare, he will always remain supreme in his own field.

---

### CHRIST OR CHAOS.

By his well-known book, 'The Christ of the Indian Road,' Mr. Stanley Jones has won for himself a large public who will listen to his words with eager attention. This makes his latest book, *Christ and Present World Issues* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), important. For he has something



serious and urgent to say in it. It is a bold and a Christian book. It is bold because what he advocates is nothing short of Christian Communism. The Russian experiment he condemns, but always with a qualifying clause. If only Russia were not anti-religious, if only it would make room for God, it would not be far away from his ideal. Fascism and Naziism he fiercely and wholly repudiates, and Communism so far as it dethrones God and disrupts family life. But his own position is very radical. The book is Christian alike in its spirit, in its loyalty to Christ, and in its passionate plea for justice to the poor and needy.

His message to our generation is the Kingdom of God. It was Christ's supreme aim to preach and to found the Kingdom. And the Kingdom is not merely God's rule in the soul but a reconstruction which would extend through the economic, social, political, physical, spiritual, and the total order, to be accomplished by the redemptive Spirit of God, working directly and through every right agency. It is God ruling all life. As to particulars, there are two features of the Kingdom which are stressed by the writer. The Spirit of Christ will unify all life. This does not mean merely a good spirit pervading all classes. You cannot have the unity of the Kingdom without economic and social unity. You cannot have real unity 'across the chasms of economic and social differences.' This would seem to imply a 'classless' society. Not, it is true, a society with only the proletarian class, but one without any economic or social distinctions.

The other feature of the Kingdom is that the basis of economic distribution is *need*. Its watchword, to which the writer repeatedly returns, is: To each according to his need, and from each according to his ability. This is reinforced by an argument from the family. In a family each member gets his share of whatever there is according to his need. If all life was ruled by God's will, as embodied in Christ, there would be no 'needy' person at all. 'That word "need" is the axis around which human problems will revolve in the future.'

That briefly is as good a picture as we can give of what is in the writer's mind. He has chapters on Fascism and Naziism which are not conspicuous for sympathetic understanding. They are valuable, however, for the quotations they contain from authoritative totalitarian manifestoes. But the substance of the book is what has been stated above. There will be wide acceptance of one of its main contentions, that the coming of God's Kingdom, as Christ preached it, would mean a thoroughgoing

change in the structure of our social and economic system. And the earnestness and sincerity with which this is urged will make a deep impression on the open-minded reader.

But it must be frankly said that there are many open and sympathetic minds that will be inclined to put some large queries opposite some of the writer's statements. Is it true, for one, that in a Christian society need will be the basis of economic distribution? This goes beyond the classic socialist demand: 'to each according to his *services*, from each according to his ability,' which seems both more ethical and more Christian. The family is a bad precedent. For in a family the members only get according to their need when they are children or ailing. And for another query, must there be economic sameness to produce real unity in a society? Will there ever be a society, so long as human beings are human, where there are no social and economic distinctions? Do these not exist even in Russia?

But these are lesser matters, and the strained exegesis of Scripture which is not uncommon, and the tendency to 'press' arguments, are still lesser. What has to be said and emphasized about this book is that it is a really noble challenge to conventional Christianity. The acceptance of Christ's will is not merely an individual renewal. It would mean a renewal of society from top to bottom, and a radical reconstruction of its basis. If this book succeeds in getting its readers to face that issue it will have done a great service.

#### LOVE AND JOHN WESLEY.

Mrs. G. Elsie Harrison has made a racy, fascinating, and valuable addition to the literature that deals with John Wesley—*Son to Susanna: The Private Life of John Wesley* (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net). Mrs. Harrison, as the title shows, limits her studies primarily to the private life; and readers will soon discover that the aspect exhibited is mainly his relations with women. Before we look at these, let us make some remarks of a general nature about the book.

As to style it is charming. It abounds in graceful and apt literary allusion. It is 'impressionistic,' bringing a scene vividly before the reader's mind with a few deft strokes. The authoress shares in the portrait-painting of Dickens and the whimsicality of Barrie. In short, the book is a sheer delight to read.

The 'debunking' so common in our time is too often tempted or apt to do violence to history—



poor John Knox has been a notable sufferer. Not the least of the merits of this treatment of Wesley is that nothing is asserted which is not borne out by the diligent research on which Mrs. Harrison bases her study. Nor as to the central figures can we find that fair balance has not been kept. Our one doubt is as to whether the hymn-writing brother Charles is not set in too unrelievedly unfavourable light. That in character he was far from the equal of John is universally admitted; but here he seldom appears except as a parasite and a nuisance, and in the most thrilling section of the book about Grace Murray, as a scoundrel.

The first woman with whom John Wesley was concerned was, of course, his mother. So close were the bonds between them that John never escaped her influence; to the end he was the 'son of Susanna.' Mrs. Harrison gives a very racy account of the extraordinary *ménage* into which John was born; the blustering, pompous ex-dissenter, High-Church father; the practical, clear-sighted, long-suffering mother; the problem of debt and many mouths; the fire from which John, still a child, was rescued, which he never forgot, and which may well have caused a 'complex.'

John had a surprising number of love-affairs. We lose all patience with this tardy wooer who never could propose in time, and allowed the prizes to be carried off by more impulsive and ardent hands. John was cursed with a certain indecision. Even when he was a young boy, 'I will consider of it' was often on his lips. As to matrimony he 'considered' too long. It seems most probable that Nature had designed him for celibacy. He loved women in a brotherly way. He found their conversation profitable and pleasant; he loved to correspond with them; they appealed to him intellectually, æsthetically, and spiritually. The beautiful girls, however, whom he 'dangled' after, were not likely to be satisfied with just that. With all their spirituality they remained normally-constituted, healthy, young women who aspired to wifehood and motherhood. John does not seem to have been quite aware of such things. Then tragically by one of life's ironies, after a series of valuable losses through his own procrastination, he married in haste one who was utterly unsuitable, a thorn in the flesh to buffet him.

This is Mrs. Harrison's main story, and she makes this transcript from real life as thrilling as any novel. It must be understood, however, that interwoven with this tale of folly and tragedy in love, is an excellent and penetrating account of John's spiritual pilgrimage and of the development of

that most real love of his for God and for sinners which made of him the evangelist who transformed the face of England, and probably saved our country from the horrors of a revolution such as France underwent. Two events in particular are movingly described, Wesley's 'warming of the heart' and his death. Yet it is almost unfair to single them out from a whole which is of such uniformly high standard.

#### JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Under the general name 'Judaism and Christianity,' a second volume of essays has been published by the Sheldon Press—*The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures*—and edited by Mr. Herbert Loewe (12s. 6d. net). Like its predecessor, of which it is a real continuation, the new book consists of lectures given by both Jewish and Christian scholars. Thus Mr. Loewe himself describes the ideals of Pharisaism, and Dr. E. Rosenthal the relations between Judaism and early Islam, while Rabbi L. Rabinowitz draws a vivid picture of Jewry in thirteenth-century France. On the Christian side, Canon W. L. Knox discusses Pharisaism and Hellenism, with an estimate of Philo which will be new to many readers; and the Rev. J. Parkes sketches the attitude of the Empire to Judaism, with special reference to the theological controversy with the Early Church. A lecture by Dr. G. G. Coulton on the Feudal period has been edited by Mr. A. C. Adcock, who also contributes an illuminating account of the fortunes of the Jews during the Reformation period, while the last chapter is by Dr. H. F. Stewart, and forms a comparative study of Jewish and Jesuitical dialectics. The outstanding feature of the whole is the strong sympathy with which each side regards the other; as Mr. Loewe remarks in his preface, 'the separate essays have not needed reconciliation.' If it be not invidious to select special chapters, it is in the work of Mr. Loewe himself and of Dr. Parkes that we are most conscious of this ability to take another's point of view. Both writers give evidence of profound scholarship—few living Christians can know Judaism as well as Dr. Parkes does—but it would be difficult to point to any feature of the work of either which indicated a strong preference for one religion or the other, though, on independent grounds, we know that each is a steadfast adherent of his own faith. Rabbi Rabinowitz, Dr. Coulton, and Mr. Adcock deal with subjects of which the average reader will know very little, and they throw a flood of light on the periods under discussion.

Mr. Adcock, in particular, helps us to realize how important was the part played in the Reformation by the Christian revival of Hebrew studies. The other essays, if less striking than these, are quite their equal in learning and in attractive presentation of their subjects. 'Pharisaism,' however, is somewhat misleading till we have read Mr. Loewe's explanation of the term. It was the Pharisaic side of Judaism that survived the catastrophe of A.D. 70, and the word is used of orthodox Judaism from that time onwards. The book, alike for its scholarship and for its interest, deserves to be read by all who have an interest in the history and thought of either Judaism or Christianity.

### THE NAGAS.

*The Rengma Nagas*, by Mr. J. P. Mills, M.A., I.C.S. (Macmillan; 25s. net), is one of those ethnographical surveys which aim at preserving a record of the customs and traditions of a small and rapidly disappearing community. The particular tribe to which Mr. Mills has devoted such careful study are, he claims, a body of 'unspoilt primitive people' living among the mountains to the east of Assam, bordering on Burma. They are rapidly, under the influence of the American Baptist Mission which works among them, abandoning many of their old and, no doubt, often evil, ways and becoming Christianized. The interest of the student of primitive anthropology is different from that of the Christian evangelist, but their interests need not conflict, and it is important that the missionary should realize what is good as well as what is harmful in the ancient folk-ways of the people among whom he works, and should accept the help and advice of one like Mr. Mills in discriminating between these.

Thus, no one would suggest that head-hunting—even though its aim is to increase the fertility of the crops and the cattle—should be maintained, but there are customs that are less easily judged. One of these is that which relates to what the Nagas call the 'morung.' This is, Mr. Mills says, 'a club far more strictly preserved from feminine intrusion than any club in England,' to which the adolescent boy goes when it seems shameful to him to sleep any longer in the same room as his parents. It is there he learns the discipline of his fellows, but it is evident that he may learn much else as well that is not good. In undermining this institution the Mission, according to Mr. Mills, 'is taking a very dangerous step from which they would assuredly have shrunk if they had considered the psychological

aspect of the matter.' Similarly, in the case of the 'bride-price,' Mr. Mills holds that this payment is not 'an immoral sale of the girl,' but 'compensation for her leaving the clan, and of immense moral value.' How to preserve the good in such customs and guard against the evil is a problem that concerns those who are seeking to help such primitive people everywhere, and much harm has come from careless or ignorant handling of what reaches far down into the life of a people. A book like this of Mr. Mills, so full of intimate knowledge and understanding of these helpless children, who are so easily injured irretrievably by our contact with them, even while we are eager to help them, should be fully considered and its warnings heeded.

It is quite superfluous to commend a study which is so manifestly thorough and intimate as this of Mr. Mills. He writes as one who not only knows his people but has a real affection for them, and who sees clearly and laments the dangers that threaten them. 'New cultures,' he says, 'must inevitably impinge upon them, and that it should destroy them is painful to those who love them.' That the missionaries love them quite as much no one can doubt. Co-operation between those who are agreed in seeking the good of such primitive children, whether of India or Africa, or of any other land, is much to be desired and ought to be attainable.

### THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING.

A very interesting and in some ways satisfying book has been written by the Rev. Wilfred L. Knox and the Rev. Alec. R. Vidler, both priests of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, on *The Gospel of God and the Authority of the Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The explanation of the dual title is that the authors have set out to answer the two questions, (1) What is the Christian Gospel? and (2) In what sense is the teaching of the Church authoritative? It will be noticed that the second question differs slightly from what the title suggests. It is the authority of the Church's *teaching* the book deals with, not that of the Church itself. And authority is defined as 'title to be believed.' It is sharply distinguished from infallibility. And this distinction is emphasized by the modest claim made for the Church's rendering of the gospel, that it is 'not a final or intellectually adequate statement of revelation' but 'the best available account of it,' or 'a working hypothesis which is being continually confirmed,' and 'a reliable guide, which is adequate for all practical purposes, to the experience of



revelation, *i.e.*, to the experience of God revealed in the Person of Christ.'

'Lest this may seem to leave the authority concerned in the air we are pointed to the experience of the saints as the final confirmation of the doctrine. The history of the Church, in this sense, is the best confirmation of the truth of the Catholic faith. This or that statement may be liable to error, but 'as a developing whole Christian doctrine is entitled to be accepted as providing . . . adequate guidance to the practice of the Christian life.' All this is worked out with charm and intelligence. Incidentally there are two passages of special value on Form-Criticism and on the claim to papal infallibility. It would be difficult to find a clearer criticism of this claim in brief compass.

---

Language owing to its ambiguities is by no means a perfect instrument of argumentation. The simple word 'is,' for example, may signify existence, or identity, or inclusion in a class, or implication. In this respect language differs from mathematics where symbols are used with precision and chains of reasoning are firmly linked. Naturally, therefore, thinkers of a mathematical turn of mind have sought to give to logic the precision of mathematics by creating a system of symbols which could be defined with accuracy. Reasoning could then be conducted by means of a series of mathematical equations. The classical example of this is the 'Principia Mathematica' of Whitehead and Russell. That work, however, is to the general reader a mystery through its cabalistic symbolism. *An Introduction to Symbolic Logic* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) has now been written by Susanne K. Langer which helps to let daylight in on the whole subject. It is written with admirable clearness, and there is no reason why any one, with a little care and patience, may not follow the exposition and become familiar with the symbols. The writer is an enthusiastic admirer of the work of Whitehead and claims that the use of symbols has greatly extended the power of logic. 'If any one has ever been awed by Nature's miracle, namely, that "Large oaks from little acorns grow," surely he will be moved to respect a Science of Logic that derives, by rigorous proofs, all the facts of mathematics from the forms of propositions.' Many, however, it is to be feared, will manifest their respect by maintaining a respectful distance from the whole subject!

China is very much in the public mind at present, and it is opportune that a little book should be issued telling of the work of the Church Missionary Society in that land. Its title is *The Way of Partnership* (C.M.S.; 1s.), and it is written by Mrs. Gwendolen R. Barclay and others. Mrs. Barclay, the wife of the C.M.S. Far Eastern Secretary, visited the China Missions in the winter of 1936-1937, and she gives here some account of them, with the help of missionaries who each deal with their own special branch of the work. We have chapters on Student Life, Village Life, Hospital Work, Women's Work, etc. The narratives, though brief, are highly interesting and are packed full of information.

---

Edward Irving is one of the most puzzling and pathetic figures in the religious history of the nineteenth century. Endowed with wonderful gifts that seemed capable of lifting him to the top-most heights, he yet, for lack of something in the way of essential balance, went off the rails and literally tore himself to pieces. His biography by Mrs. Oliphant has long been a standard work, but it does not exhaust the field, and it leaves ample room for a fresh treatment. This is given in *Edward Irving and his Circle*, by the Rev. Andrew Landale Drummond, Ph.D., B.D., S.T.M. (James Clarke; 8s. 6d. net). The work is very competently and sympathetically done. The writer succeeds in giving a truly living picture of Irving. But the special value of his book lies in its comprehensive treatment of the phenomena connected with the gift of tongues. This whole subject is now much better understood than it was in Irving's day through psychological research, and the relevant material is here presented with clearness and sanity so that the reader is guided to a reasonable judgment upon it. For this alone the book is well worth reading, and it deserves an honoured place on the shelf of religious biography.

---

Principal Harrison, B.Sc., D.D., of Westminster Training College, London, has contributed to Duckworth's Theology series an account of *Arminianism* (5s. net). The story of Arminianism is a long one. It began early in the seventeenth century as a rebellion against rigorous Calvinism, and more or less the controversy has continued ever since. The pendulum of theological thought has swung between the two poles, and in our own day there has been in some quarters a swing back towards Calvinism. It is not only a long story but it is far from easy to tell. It cannot be made intelligible without a

great amount of detail as to individual teachers, and there is a risk that for the ordinary reader that mass of details will prove repulsive and unmanageable. This hard task of giving sufficient detail and remaining interesting has been splendidly achieved by Dr. Harrison. Of special interest, of course, are the passages dealing with the reception of Arminianism in England by the school of Laud, the Cambridge Platonists, the later Latitudinarians, and, most interesting of all, by the great evangelical Wesley.

The beginner in the study of Comparative Religion will find *The Elements of Comparative Theology*, by the Rev. F. Harold Smith, D.D. (Duckworth; 5s. net.), an exceedingly useful introduction. It is elementary in the sense that it does not presuppose much previous knowledge—indeed the author occasionally seems to underrate the intelligence of his readers—but it is comprehensive, accurate, and written with commendable clarity. The method of treatment is perhaps a little artificial. Dr. Smith makes use of five categories of ideas—of Sacred Literature, God, Cosmology, the Good Life, and Salvation, and applies them in turn to the various religions. This results in an admirable presentation of the teachings of the religions on these topics separately, but does not permit easily of a *total* view of any one religion, and is apt to lead to unnecessary repetition. It is questionable, also, whether, under the first category, the idea of inspiration is not unduly narrowed to verbal inspiration, and thus rendered less adequate for discriminative application to the different religions. Under Cosmology, the idea of creation *ex nihilo* seems to be hardly sufficiently analysed, but the difficult distinction between creation and emanation is effectively made.

By far the best chapter in the book is that on 'Man and the Good Life.' The basic requirements of ethics are applied for the purpose of an illuminating classification of religions, and we have rarely come across so adequate a short summary of the teachings of the Vedānta and of Buddhism on the topics belonging to this section. The author is better at particularizing description than at generalizations, and his exposition of the parallel Christian teaching is disappointingly slight; but probably this conciseness is due to the assumption that for the majority of his readers fuller treatment is unnecessary in view of the knowledge they already possess. As a whole, the book is a most excellent short presentation of the fundamental conceptions of the prominent world-religions—Shintoism, Con-

fucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Muhammadanism, and Christianity.

The title of the latest volume by the Reverend James Reid, D.D., is *The Temple in the Heart* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). The title comes from the first study—'The true place of worship is not a geographical locality. It is not a special place at all. God is not localized in any particular spot or building. It is in the temple within the heart we must find Him.' There are altogether sixty-three short studies in this volume marked by all the qualities that we associate with Dr. Reid's work—deep spirituality, evangelical fervour, penetrating thought, and all couched in simple direct language. Most if not all of the studies have already appeared in 'The British Weekly.' Many who have read them there will be glad to have them in book form to use for devotional reading.

All interested in Christian mysticism of the best type may be warmly recommended to a perusal of *Saint John of the Cross, 1542-1591*, by Father Bede Frost, O.S.B. (Hodder & Stoughton; 18s. net). The book describes itself as an introduction to the Saint's philosophy, theology, and spirituality. It is a work of high scholarly merit by one who has to a great extent thought himself into the standpoint of his hero, and who inspires confidence that his exposition of the teaching of St. John is thoroughly adequate.

A third edition has been issued of Professor C. J. Cadoux's *Roman Catholicism and Freedom* (Independent Press; 5s. net). Some new points and answers to criticisms are appended. The book has had a wonderful circulation; a second edition was called for within six months of the first in 1936, and now a third has been found necessary, for which, we are confident, there will also be a large sale. In view of this conspicuous success we are inclined to deprecate the reprinting of the preface to the second edition, in which the learned author complained of the ignoring of his book by a large section of the Press, attributing this to Roman Catholic influence.

Not all sermons given in school chapels are worth publishing, but Mr. Sydney Moore's '*Wherewithal* . . .' (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net) is an outstanding example of what such addresses should be. Mr. Moore is well acquainted with the results of Biblical scholarship; his religion is an experiential one and



he knows his audience. He neither speaks down to it nor does he dwell on experiences which boys still at a public school could not share in. We have quoted from one of the addresses in 'The Christian Year,' and we would commend the volume to all interested in the religious education of the young.

A short course of lectures delivered last Spring in Sion College has been enlarged by the lecturer, the Rev. L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D., and published with the title *England and the New Learning* (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). In the first, which deals with the New Learning in Europe and English pioneers, the author does good service in demolishing the prevalent delusion that the Renaissance was due to the Fall of Constantinople. On the contrary, it was in Italy a revival of classical culture, and when Constantinople fell it marked an end rather than a beginning, for it meant that search in that city for ancient manuscripts, which had been going on for a long time previously, came to a sudden end. We have in this lecture a clarifying discussion on what the Renaissance meant beyond the Alps in contrast to Italy. The second lecture deals with Colet and More at Oxford, and the third with Fisher and Erasmus at Cambridge. The fourth, in some ways most interesting of all, deals with the complicated question as to how the New Learning and the Reformation were related. The New Learning, in brief, created a new atmosphere, increased the value of the individual and, most fruitful of all, insisted on sound method and sound learning which drove men back to a study of the original basis of Christianity in the Scriptures.

*The Origin of Heathendom*, by Mr. Ben Adam (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), is an ingenious and interesting book. The writer shows considerable knowledge of Hebrew, and he engages in a careful study of certain Old Testament words. He treats the early narratives of Genesis as divinely inspired history, and although many readers will be unable to follow him in this, they will find here grounds for reflecting that there may be more in these ancient stories than they may have supposed. His argument is that the human race was scattered by a penal act of God who split up the primeval unity of the dry land into its several continents. The theory of a primeval united continent has very respectable geological evidence in support of it, much more than is indicated in this book, but probably no geologist would place the great divide at a date after the human race had appeared on the

earth. The closing chapters of the book deal with the obscure subject of the union of the sons of God with the daughters of men, and the resulting race of the Rephaim.

Dr. Campbell Morgan has published a very excellent little book on *Preaching* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net). It is short but much to the point. It is full of good things, thoroughly practical, and lit up with illustrations and touches of humour. He holds the essentials of preaching to be Truth, Clarity, and Passion. He bases all preaching on the Word; and in answer to the question, Why have a text? he gives three reasons: 'first, the authority that is in the text as being a part of the Word of God; second, the definiteness which it must give, when properly dealt with, to the Christian message; and finally, the maintenance of variety.' He is all for careful exegesis. 'I would rather have Westcott on John than all the devotional books on that Gospel that I have ever seen.'

The anthropomorphism which dominates the earlier strata of the Old Testament is hardly a serious problem for the modern scholar. If higher criticism had done nothing else, it would have justified itself by its rearrangement of the Biblical material in historical order. We are thus enabled to see the steady, if slow, process of divine revelation, and we are no longer surprised or shocked at finding statements and views in the Old Testament which appear to conflict with the fuller knowledge of God. The Rabbis of the early Christian centuries, however, had no such apologetic weapon in their hands, and were deeply concerned by the evidence of inadequate theology suggested in many Old Testament passages. Their attempts to solve the problem have been ably presented and discussed by Dr. Marmorstein in his *Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: II. Essays in Anthropomorphism* (Milford; 5s. net). Through succeeding generations of Jewish scholars he traces the conflict between two schools of interpretation, the allegorical and the literal. The former may avoid theological difficulties, but numbers of learned and devout Jews felt that it did not do justice to the method and purpose of revelation. Some other means of escape had to be found, as, for instance, the humble statement 'we should not have dared to think this, unless it had stood in the Bible.' Dr. Marmorstein's work, published under the auspices of the Jews' College, will be of interest, not only to his co-religionists, but also to Christian students of the Bible.

With obvious fitness the editors of 'The Clarendon Bible' have entrusted the most theological of the epistles of Paul to one of the most distinguished theologians in the Church of England. Canon K. E. Kirk's exposition of Romans—*The Epistle to the Romans* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net)—is at once a welcome complement and an interesting contrast to that of a no less distinguished New Testament scholar, Professor C. H. Dodd, in 'The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.' The latter, in his Introduction, gives four pages to 'the thought of the Epistle'; the former, in one hundred pages, on 'the main ideas of the Epistle,' provides what is really a substantial treatise on Pauline theology. This difference is significant. Canon Kirk, as a systematic theologian, is concerned to reduce to order Paul's deplorably unsystematic presentation of Christian truth. At the same time he strives to show that the apostle's conception of Christianity is at all points 'Catholic,' not 'Protestant.' Those who do not share his outlook will often find him more stimulating than convincing, but perhaps just for that reason it is they who will profit most from the study of his book. They may also feel that he lacks—in notable contrast to Professor Dodd—that sympathetic understanding of Paul which is the best guide in the interpretation of difficult passages. The commentary proper is by comparison brief, and sometimes seems a little perfunctory (see, for example, the note on 8<sup>28</sup>, which does little more than refer the reader to 'the larger commentaries').

*An Ambassador in Chains*, by the Rt. Rev. Arthur B. L. Karney, D.D. (Mowbray; 5s. net), does not in its title give any indication of its contents. In the main it is a popular exposition of St. Paul's 'Prison Epistles'—Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon—with the addition of five short chapters on 'Paul's Prison Prayers.' The writer, who is Bishop of Southampton, is anxious for the revival of expository preaching, and in an introductory chapter he discusses, in a very suggestive and helpful way, the whole problem of church services. The expositions themselves will be found to be scholarly and full of help for popular preaching.

*Our Noble Heritage*, by the Rev. J. Findlater (Roberts; 4s. net), is an earnest plea to British Protestants to guard against the danger of losing the heritage of gospel truth and ordered liberty won at the Reformation. The writer sees the hidden hand of Rome in many of the sinister policies of the time. He has much to say about the doctrine of election, and is confident enough to imagine that

if he could have pointed out certain things to Calvin, 'that great and good man would have come to agree with me.' And after a similar demonstration, Martin Luther 'from his warm-hearted soul would have thanked me for thus filling in that part of the picture which he had left blank.'

A new, and entirely rewritten, edition of a book which has been useful and much used since it was first issued in 1916 has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—*The Christian's Claim about Jesus of Nazareth; Perfect God and Perfect Man*, by the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. (2s. net). The lectures on which the book is based were given in one form or another seven times in Hyde Park and more frequently to theological students in King's College and elsewhere. The titles of the chapters are: What the First Christians Thought about Christ, Did Jesus of Nazareth Claim to be Divine? Is the Christian Claim Credible? and Non-Christian Alternatives to the Christian Belief about Christ. This is an excellent piece of Christian apologetic, all the better for being 'popular.'

A series of liturgical, expository, and homiletical studies in the Gospels and Epistles for the Church year is published under the title, *The Eternal Word in the Modern World*, by Professor Burton S. Easton and Professor H. C. Robbins (Scribners; 8s. 6d. net). These studies originated in what may be called clinical work. One of the writers is Professor of the Interpretation of the New Testament, the other of Pastoral Theology. The former set themes for the students, the other criticised the students' performances. Out of all this, in a way not clearly explained, these 'expository notes' have arisen. The word 'liturgical,' applied to some of these outlines, means sermons dealing with the parts of Scripture selected by the Church to be read in the service.

The authors are neither Fundamentalists nor Modernists. They repudiate both, and declare their adherence to the Liberal Catholic and Liberal Evangelical standpoint. They accept the positive and constructive results of New Testament criticism, and also the Nicene theology as a revelation to the Church by the Holy Spirit of the mystery of the Person of Christ. The book is written from this standpoint. The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays in each part of the Christian year are taken, and then the Epistles and Gospels for Holy Days. There are historical and critical notes by way of introduction, followed by very full sermon outlines. The eminence of the writers



guarantees the scholarship, and the practical origin of the discourses sufficiently assures the homiletic value of the work.

If the many who are interested in the missionary activities of the Church to-day are too exclusively occupied with their present obligations and opportunities, *The English Missionaries in Sweden and Finland*, by Mr. C. J. A. Oppermann, M.A., Ph.D. (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), will be of service to those especially of Anglo-Saxon descent, and make them feel that they have entered upon a great heritage. We are told that one of the chief characteristics of the early Anglo-Saxon Church was its zeal for missionary work, and we have here a record, careful, well-documented, and obviously the outcome of immense industry, of one of the earliest objectives of its missionary activity. It is probably known to comparatively few that the Church in Sweden owes its inception largely to the labours of English missionaries. Dr. Oppermann traces the historical development of this work, the bitter struggle with heathenism, the religious significance of the Viking raids, the successes and the failures, the divided counsels amongst the missionaries as to the best methods, their relations to the various overlords, always difficult to handle, and their own plans for the organization and continuance of the Church. He is most interesting in his account of the labours of the missionary bishops, less so in his presentation of the gradual emergence of a missionary episcopate, and in his account of the various devices by which the Scandinavian countries were brought under the centralized rule of the papacy. It is curious—in view of modern parallels—to note how calmly it was assumed in these early days that the decision, by a majority vote, of a Council could determine the religion of a whole people. Evidently some of the problems of present-day missionary policy would have been more easily solved from the point of view of these early missionaries; and it is rather startling to find how frequently the Anglo-Swedish pioneers resembled Elijah in his treatment of the prophets of Baal. But the lesson was gradually learnt in Sweden, as elsewhere, that force or high-handedness is of no avail in the upbuilding of the Christian Church, and that only in peaceful penetration lies the hope of continuance.

A notable addition to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge's 'Transactions of Early Documents' has been made by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., in *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (4s. 6d. net). On the Apostolic Fathers Lightfoot remains the great

English authority, but Lightfoot did not say the final word. Knowledge has increased since his time, and fruitful discussion has abounded. Of that newer knowledge Dr. Clarke is fully abreast. He gives an admirable translation of Clement, and clarifies difficulties in excellent notes. All this is preceded by brief but illuminating discussions on the Church in Rome, the fate of Paul and Peter, church-organization in the Epistle, its theology and leading ideas, the difficult problem occasioned by its failure to quote from our Gospels, the use made of other New Testament writings, and so on. The work aims at letting the ordinary reader know of this important early Christian document and what light it casts upon the Church at the end of the first century. For that purpose as well as for its scholarly qualities, which will make it very useful to all students of the early days of Christianity, we cordially welcome it.

*The Saints of Egypt* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), by the Rev. De Lacy O'Leary, D.D., Lecturer at Bristol University, is published for the Church Historical Society. The author, who has already written learnedly on the Coptic Church, aims in these pages at providing a compendium of information about the martyrs and other saints honoured in the Coptic Church. He has followed, for the most part, the biographies given in the Jacobite (Egyptian) Synaxarium, but has given some additional matter necessary for the illustration of those lives. The catalogue has been arranged alphabetically and may be readily consulted. The first part of the book, which is nearly one-fourth of the whole, treats of the foundation of the Church of Alexandria, the Coptic language, the Egyptian martyrs, Egyptian monasticism, sources for the lives of the saints, and the Coptic calendar. It is a learned and scholarly work and has all the appearance of being reliable.

The Student Christian Movement Press has issued a very useful little guide to the divisions of the Church and to its reunions, edited by the Rev. E. G. Parry—*The Divisions of the Church: A Historical Guide* (1s. net). Its aim is to give some information as to the origin and features of the churches represented at the second World Conference on Faith and Order, and to reveal what reunions have already taken place. The information is accurate, and while, from the nature of the case, the treatment is slight, yet by its clear and concise presentation of the basal facts, frequently assisted by diagrams, the pamphlet—for it is no more—will prove interesting and instructive.

## Christianity in Action.

Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, C.H., D.D.

BY THE REVEREND H. L. JOHNSTON, M.C., M.A., RECTOR OF CRANLEIGH, SURREY.

THE passing of Canon H. R. L. Sheppard has made many stop to re-think the value which they had put on his work. When he was alive it was so easy, because this or that aspect of his work seemed incompatible with cherished traditions, to write off all that he stood for as being the outcome of an unbalanced, even though an exceptionally attractive, personality. But during these last two months it has been less difficult to get a truer perspective, and some of the things that have been disclosed have forced many to think again.

The Dean of St. Paul's, in an exceptionally discerning tribute at his funeral, referred to him as a primitive Christian who could not be expected to be completely at home in this modern world, and as one who was prepared to make of himself a fool for Christ. If these two thoughts are traced back through some of his outstanding activities, it may help to show the way in which he manifested Christianity in action in the world to-day.

While he loved the Church in which he had been brought up and into whose ministry he was ordained in 1907, he was for ever breaking away from conventions and from the letter of ecclesiastical tradition, and making the true heart of Christianity shine through the normal and more stereotyped forms of Church life. As chaplain and afterwards Head of Oxford House his insuppressible vitality poured itself out in binding all and sundry, from the East End or the West, to himself with bonds of personal affection, and then diverting the response to his infectious goodness into the highest channels. In those days, though few might have dared to speak of him as 'the most Christlike man I ever knew,' many have confessed that their knowledge of their Lord and Saviour came to them through what they felt reflected in his life.

Seldom in bed before 2 a.m. or after 6 a.m., his constitution was unable to stand the strain, and he was compelled to resign from Oxford House. Before his ordination he had acted as private secretary to the present Archbishop of Canterbury—who was then Bishop of Stepney: once more during his convalescence he joined him as his assistant Chaplain at York.

It was during this period that he conceived the idea of a West End Club having as its motive and

background the ideal of Christian service: after his return to London to take charge of St. Mary's, Bourdon Street, this took shape and the Cavendish Club was opened. The idea of a club with these ideals for laymen, to which no parson was admitted for ordinary membership, but which yet had a chapel and a chaplain, even called for comment in *Punch*. But those of the two thousand original members who survive will testify that he was able to infect the club with the real spirit of Christianity which sought its outlet in practical social service of all kinds. The idea of men's religion being helped to find expression in the normal and natural surroundings of their everyday lives is one that has not even yet begun to be developed. As the problem of the Parochial system, at any rate in towns, appears to be increasingly difficult, it may be that the line he took is one that might well be further explored at the present time.

On the face of it, the natural associations in which men are banded together are surely the ground on which there is most likely to be a response to the highest values of life, and the best chance of finding expression for corporate worship and true Christianity. Factories, combines, firms, industries, associations, clubs, and common interests may yet indicate the new forms of parish boundaries into which the energies of an evangelizing Church can best be poured in modern days. And those few firms who have had the courage to go beyond a 'welfare worker,' and definitely employ chaplains to care for the souls and minds and bodies of their employees, would probably have tales to tell that would make the subject-matter of Diocesan Conferences seem trivial.

After a period in charge of the Grosvenor Chapel he was in 1914 appointed vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. After two months at the Front, attached to an Australian Auxiliary Hospital which went overseas with the Expeditionary Force, he settled down to face this new sphere. The present vicar of St. Martin's, when Canon Sheppard's body was brought to his old church to rest, read to those who were gathered there an extract from the first sermon he preached on the Sunday after his induction. It gave a vision of what he believed that church, set at the very heart of the Empire, might



be allowed to stand for, and the part it might play in the lives of those who would otherwise pass by on the other side.

That vision was fulfilled within ten years, and it was fulfilled because all his gifts of imagination, foresight, patience, organization, business capacity, and leadership were shot through with love of ordinary people, the kind of love that reflected to men the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ.

It would seem of little use to tell of what he did at St. Martin's except to those who had the chance of knowing what he was to all and sundry during those years. But certain facts must be chronicled because they imply more than the bare narrative can convey.

In 1915 a simple choral Communion service at 10.15 on Sundays was started: within the year the notice appeared that 'the church is now free and open, and no sittings are allotted.' In May 1916 the dinner-hour services were inaugurated, and with the Bishop of London's permission laymen were invited to give the addresses. In October 1916 it was decided that the church should be kept open all night as well as all day, so that those who were homeless or stranded might take shelter there. The following month the Bishop's sanction was obtained for an altered form of morning service on Sundays: and about the same time the 'Guild of Fellowship' began to take shape. In March of 1917 the first of the special Sunday afternoon services for men and women in uniform was held, the music being provided by a band lent by one of the Guards Regiments. After demobilization the service was continued (and still is) as a service for the people, *i.e.* for those who do not at present attend the regular services of the church. In September of the same year the hour's music on Saturday afternoons was introduced, about which the vicar wrote in his Magazine: 'I am clear that the more our church is used for what is beautiful the more we will be loved, and the more our regular services will call to our people to worship the Lord of all Beauty.' Another innovation was the use to which he put the period after the evening service on Sunday. He would invite speakers to give a thirty to forty-five minutes' talk, or a lantern lecture, on all kinds of different subjects, social, philanthropic, missionary, or historical; it often proved that nearly three-quarters of the large congregation at the evening service were glad to stop for such talks, whereas probably only a handful would have come together for special meetings and addresses on the same subjects.

On the day of the Armistice and for the two

following days the church was packed day and night, and special commemoration services were held at intervals when 'we prayed for strength and grace to stand the strain of peace.'

In 1919 the vicar wrote in the Magazine: 'I should be perfectly willing to have an evening Communion if actual names of those unable to receive their Communion at the ordinary hours when it is offered were sent me. I am quite willing to meet a perfectly genuine and legitimate demand, but I am not in this respect willing to create one.' It is noteworthy that the evidence for this demand was not considered adequate for another five years, but in 1924 the following note appeared: 'Many have criticised but many more have approved our action in starting evening Communion once a month. The expressions of thanks from those who came to the service on 6th April were more than enough to convince us that our motive in starting the service was the right one.' This service was held once a month, separated from the ordinary evening service by an interval of one hour.

In 1923 Armistice Day fell on a Sunday, and the Home Office for the first time in history allowed a religious meeting in Trafalgar Square. It took the form of a simple service, the music being played by a massed band of the Guards, and the addresses given by Mr. Sheppard and Mr. Ritchie. Two years later many will remember that as a result of a letter from Mr. Sheppard to the *Times* entitled 'Is it in Keeping?' a charity ball arranged for Armistice Night at the Albert Hall was at the last moment postponed, and its place taken by a special Service of Commemoration. This single-handed effort undoubtedly did more than anything else towards preserving the due observance of Armistice Day up and down the country.

On 6th January 1924, the first religious service was broadcast from a church: the experiment was made at the request of the religious Committee of the B.B.C., and as a result of the experience gained from this first service from St. Martin's, Mr. Sheppard expressed his opinion that such a service might well be broadcast regularly, not more than once a month, and that at an hour when evening services are not being held elsewhere.

The B.B.C. then asked for a service to be broadcast each month from St. Martin's, and it was only when he had found out that neither St. Paul's nor Westminster Abbey were prepared to undertake it that Mr. Sheppard consented to accede to this request. The first of the regular broadcast services on the second Sunday in the month was held on 13th April 1924.

The years 1924-26 saw the gradual failure of Mr. Sheppard's health under the unceasing strain he put on his mind and body, and in September of 1926 he found it necessary to give notice of his intended resignation from St. Martin's. Such is the bare outline of some of the more familiar features of his ministry at St. Martin's, but no chronicle can hope to convey any impression of the spirit which animated him, and with which he filled the church which he served.

His amazing sympathy with and understanding of the needs of ordinary people was the source of all such experiments as he made; some of them are the commonplaces of Church life and activity to-day, and it is difficult to remember the extent to which he was a pioneer. His was an almost unerring touch on human nature, and in many ways he was able to provide for the expression of people's deepest aspirations and longings before even they had realized their own need for such expression.

He was convinced that the formalism and coldness of churches and their apparent aloofness from ordinary life could be overcome without even for a moment losing anything of the truth or the depths of spiritual experience to which they were a witness. He translated the Church to the people, and showed its readiness to try and meet their needs and to stretch out a helping hand of love to those who were neglected and little loved. The opening of the church all night as a shelter for those who were stranded or homeless did not stop at merely providing an alternative to the streets, but every effort was made under his guidance to put men and women in touch with other agencies of mercy and of passing many of them on to the St. Martin's Hostel, which has done and is doing so much to get men on to their feet again, and back once more to work.

The week-day services and the addresses on every conceivable topic, and the Saturday and Sunday music were used to supply the needs of the mental and æsthetic side of human nature, and all that contributed to the true fullness of life seemed to him to have a natural place in the activities of a church.

But when all is said and done, it was the way in which he used the services of the Church and all its activities to shed abroad the love of God in men's hearts that will remain the abiding memory of his ministry at St. Martin's.

There followed three years of complete inactivity, crippled by frequent and intense bouts of asthma and consequent sleeplessness. During this period

the scope and variety of his reading was prodigious. But cut off from all the activity of life, and unable to immerse himself in the work that he loved, his restless spirit was for ever questioning the true values for which the Church stood, and seeing them overlaid by a wealth of trivialities which seemed to bear no real relation to the way of life revealed by our Lord. Some of the doubts and questionings that haunted him found expression in the book he put out before the Lambeth Conference *The Impatience of a Parson*. Had he allowed himself to be content with being merely destructive, this book would possibly have had an even greater influence within the Church than it actually did have among those on the outskirts of Church life.

His appointment to the Deanery of Canterbury in 1929 came just at a time when his health had sufficiently improved to make it likely that he would be completely restored in what seemed to offer the opportunity of quiet and not too exacting work.

Canterbury Cathedral and all that it might stand for as the central shrine of the Church of England inspired him with a passionate devotion. He quickly showed that though 'no man cared less for externals; no one was more scrupulously exact that wherever ceremony was appropriate things should be done decently and in order.' But his short tenure of office is and will be most remembered in Canterbury for his astonishing capacity to make and keep friends, and to enlist their co-operation in common service.

His relationship with other people always had something intensely personal about it: such a thing as a professional relationship never existed with him: there were times when he was on duty and acted accordingly, but the staff and workmen of the cathedral and every variety of person in the city quickly came to realize that they had found a friend to whom they would turn, and one whose understanding led him to forge a personal link and see to it that their position and responsibilities earned their due recognition and appreciation.

But once again the attacks of asthma became more frequent, and he was forced before two years were over to resign. There followed another period of inactivity, during which he entered a new field. His contributions to a number of papers and journals showed his close touch with ordinary people and their problems. In spite of many who deprecated his entry into journalism, he remained convinced that he and others had a real part to



play in bringing Christianity naturally into the everyday background of people's lives—as represented by the journals that they read—and that those who would win men to Christ need not hesitate to use (and possibly help to redeem) the weapons of this world.

To quote the Dean of St. Paul's again: 'For all his modernity and close contact with the contemporary world he was a primitive Christian. He had no use for a religion that does not transform the world and save human beings from misery. . . . A primitive Christian in the modern world must be to some extent an alien and a rebel. To his sensitive spirit the thought of cruelty and oppression in our civilization was a constant torture—and still more the dark goal towards which he feared it was tending.' This sensitiveness to the tragedy of the world was what led him eventually to pour all his energy into the Peace Campaign. He saw war as something in which no Christian could ever again bear a part, and all his powers of leadership and organization were devoted to the building up of the Peace Pledge Union.

Even those who most whole-heartedly disagreed with this policy could never suspect his motives or fail to respect him for living up to his convictions, even while they themselves felt that the world's salvation could not be brought about by such means.

It is no exaggeration to say that he laid down his life for this cause. His general health had not really improved, but a special form of atomizer had been found which gave him almost instantaneous relief in his worst attacks of asthma. But though the symptom was thus kept in check, the physical exhaustion and strained heart which were its cause had not been overcome, when there came to him the offer of a canonry at St. Paul's. He accepted the post with the greatest reluctance, and at any rate until the last few days of his life could not feel happy in an atmosphere which was in many of its aspects uncongenial to him. That he had not actually resigned was due to the personal affection he felt for the Dean. His official relationship with all connected with the work of the cathedral was, as it had been at Canterbury, transformed by his personal and intimate touch. But what should have been his times of rest and leisure between his periods of official residence were filled to the full with addressing meetings in all parts of England,

attending committees, and welding together the efforts of those who were working for peace. As often as not his whole day was filled with meetings and interviews, and the night spent in travelling back to London for a full day's work, or to be ready to leave for some other distant place where he was to speak the following evening. It was a cause for which he was ready to sacrifice everything, and in the end it demanded of him the highest sacrifice of all. But a week before the end came he gained an honour that gave him very special happiness. He was elected by a large majority Lord Rector of Glasgow University—of which he had held an Honorary D.D. since 1927.

In the framework of that life of which the foregoing is but the barest sketch, Dick Sheppard constructed a masterpiece of living which will place his name among the greatest of those who have made of the Christian religion a thing of power and compelling attraction in their day. So much was he in the public eye that those who only knew of him second-hand could not easily detect his genuine simplicity and humility. He was completely unself-conscious where a cause greater than himself could be served: his moral courage was exceptional: his whole life was dominated by a passionate desire to serve his Lord and Master, and bring others to the knowledge of Him.

His friendship had a unique quality in that he seemed to give a part of himself to each of his friends and yet the part that he gave never appeared to be shared with any one else. An ever fresh sense of humour gave an added balance to all his outlook. A dreamer of dreams and a visionary, he yet had the surest of practical touches in dealing with the multifarious problems and responsibilities which he not only seemed to attract but to create. His insight into human hearts and motives led him to see through the pretensions and pretentiousness of many with whom he was brought into contact, yet he had the power when with them of doing much to win them back to that which it was in their power to become.

Such was his love, sympathy, and understanding—the outcome of a complete unselfishness and longing to serve—that it is not surprising that those who knew him longest and best, feeling how much he outdistanced them, have expressed their conviction that he was the most Christlike man they have ever known.

# Freedom and Tradition in Religious Thought.

BY PRINCIPAL W. ROBINSON, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., OVERDALE COLLEGE, SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

CHRISTIANITY did not begin as a system of speculative thought or as a reasoned theology. It began as a way of life based upon a faith. And faith was not assent to certain intellectual propositions enshrining a metaphysic about a reality or a cosmological phantasia. Faith, for the early Church, was trust in and loyalty to the Person of Christ; and dogma was not a given set of intellectual propositions to be believed on pain of death, but a set of given facts *which had happened in history*. These facts were regarded by early Christians as having a certain meaning and value for life and destiny. To put it simply, they were regarded as being, in an absolute sense, acts of God on the plane of history. The earliest compilation of these facts of which we have any record is that given by St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Church about A.D. 53. He there assures the Corinthians that he delivered unto them, first of all, that which he received, evidently referring to the instruction which had been given him by the messenger of the Damascus Church before his baptism, nearly twenty years earlier. There is good ground for believing, with Ed. Meyer, that St. Paul is here quoting the baptismal creed of the Damascus Church.<sup>1</sup> These facts enumerated are:

1. Christ Jesus died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.
2. He was buried.
3. He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.
4. He was seen of Cephas.

Here, then, we have four given happenings in history; and faith, for the early Christians, meant reliance on these happenings *as the acts of God*—just as God had once created, so now He had come to redeem. From this followed the exaltation of Jesus as Lord and Christ and the beginning of Christian worship centring in two redemption rites, which were dramatic acts setting forth the Holy Action of God within the sphere of history. When we first meet the Christian Church, faith is a simple matter of trust in and loyalty to the manifestation of the character and action of God as set forth in

the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This character of God can best be declared as *righteous love*—and both words are important.<sup>2</sup> The greatness of God had been shown to be, not power, but love. To the Jews it was a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness, but to the Christians it was a sublime faith which had been guaranteed by an act which had about it the character of once-for-allness—the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And, in spite of every contradiction in life and thought, Christians were prepared to risk all and to venture on life and shape its course as if this were true. For them this faith was sealed by such simple affirmations as, ‘I believe Jesus is Lord (*Maran*),’ and ‘I believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God,’ which were oaths of allegiance, rather than dogmatic utterances in the sense in which we to-day generally understand dogma. In their worship, which was *action* rather than words, they constantly saw the Holy Action of God re-presented in symbolic forms. In Baptism they saw set forth the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, and the personal action of God was again made intimate for them in the remission of sins. In the Breaking of the Bread they again saw Christ visibly depicted crucified, and His holy action was made meaningful and powerful in the Fellowship which shared His life and was willing to be identified with Him in making up the afflictions which were lacking—treading the path of love and not of power.

This is all very different from later forms of Christianity seen in the structure of classical Catholicism or of classical Protestantism, where dogma has become a set of given propositions, which are mainly *explanations* of given facts, set forth in closely reasoned terms, rather than the facts themselves; and where *faith* is conceived of subjectively as assent to the given propositions, and objectively

<sup>1</sup> This is what St. Paul asserts in the classic passages in Ro 3<sup>25</sup> and 5<sup>8</sup>. Surely the sense of *προβητο* as used here by St. Paul is that of a *visible* manifestation, as is the sense of *προεγράφη* as used in Gal 3<sup>1</sup>, a passage which I believe refers to the Christian Eucharist. If this is so, the sense of Ro 3<sup>25</sup> may be taken to be that in the life of Jesus, and more especially in the spectacle of the Cross, there was *placarded* once for all on the plane of history the fact that God *is* righteous, in spite of all the seeming contradictions of history. There the fact had been *floodlit*.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Co 15<sup>2-5</sup>. For justification of this idea, see *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Bk. III. p. 209 ff.



as the sum-total of the propositions themselves. In both Catholicism and Protestantism of the classical types, theological definition is of more importance than the facts to be defined, and rational assent to propositions has taken the place of personal allegiance.<sup>1</sup>

The contrast which I have drawn between the conceptions of faith and dogma in the early Church and in later classical Catholicism and Protestantism, makes it clear that in the one case there was, within the sphere of loyalty, much room for freedom of thought and liberty of interpretation; whereas in the other case such liberty has almost entirely disappeared. Instead we have developed the idea of salvation by orthodoxy. How did this change come about? It came about, in the first place, because Christianity, like any other way of life, is bound to explain itself in the thought-forms of the world in which it finds itself. And, in the second place, it came about because Christianity had to defend itself against systems of life and thought which inevitably would have perverted its central truth. Let us examine the process more closely.

In the history of Christianity there have been certain great periods when theological activity has been at a maximum, and other periods when there has been little or no such activity. These periods of theological activity may be set out as five in number:

1. The Creative Period, which begins with St. Paul and ends with St. Augustine.
2. The Scholastic Period, which may be said to have its beginning with the Revival of Learning in the tenth century and ends with St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth.
3. The Reformation Period, beginning in the early sixteenth century and going on into the seventeenth.
4. The Critical Period, beginning with Schleiermacher at the close of the eighteenth century and ending with Harnack in the early twentieth.
5. The Period of Confessionalism, which some people prefer to call The Period of Reaction,

with prophets like P. T. Forsyth, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Otto Piper, Paul Tillich, Karl Heim, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Nicolas Berdyaev.

Let us look at each of these movements in turn.

## I.

From the first of these great movements Christianity emerged with:

1. A definite hierarchical system centring in a single organ of authority—the General Council—through which the Great Church could speak dogmatically on points of doctrine, order, worship, and discipline. So far as the Eastern Church is concerned, however, the dogmatic utterance of a Council was never completely regarded as the voice of the Holy Spirit until it had received the *Consensus fidelium*. This is practically the position of the Eastern Orthodox Church to-day, though it is not generally understood by some of the auto-cephalous Churches, nor by many within all the Churches.<sup>2</sup>
2. A sacred Canon of Holy Scripture, identical—at least in the West—with our present Canon, which Canon was accepted as a norm by which to test all development in doctrine and practice.
3. Certain doctrines clearly defined, and safeguarded in most cases by a Creed which had oecumenical authority (the present form of the Nicene Creed). These doctrines included:
  - (a) The doctrine of the Person of Christ which was set forth as two natures in one Person.
  - (b) The doctrine of God, which was set forth as one of trine-unity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God.
  - (c) The doctrine of Grace, which declared the inability of man to save himself, and was set forth in terms of predestination.
  - (d) The doctrine of the Church, which declared its visible unity as the organ of Christ's will and the sole sphere of salvation.

<sup>1</sup> This can hardly be asserted of the creeds which played their part in defining dogma in the Conciliar period of Church history, such as The Apostles' Creed (in its various forms), the original Nicene Creed, The Creed of Constantinople, The Creed of Eusebius, The Creed of Chalcedon. Here, in the main, dogma is still concerned with facts rather than the explanation of facts, though perhaps the personal aspect of faith has been largely lost sight of.

<sup>2</sup> See a recent memorandum submitted by Father Sergius Boulgakoff to the Metropolitan Eulogias in refutation of a heresy charge. In this Memorandum he sets forth the Orthodox doctrine of the *Consensus fidelium*.

(e) The doctrine of Revelation, which declared the given-ness of God's will in the sacred Scriptures. By this time the doctrine of Revelation had hardened into that of Verbal Inspiration—an inheritance which the early Christian Church had received from Jewish Scholastic Theology.

4. The two great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, as dramatic vehicles for representing the central facts of the Christian Faith and as channels of grace.

As yet there had been no attempt to define what later became a great centre of controversy—the doctrine of the Atonement.

Throughout the whole of this period there had been much freedom of thought, much controversy (which naturally goes along with freedom of thought), and much variety of emphasis, especially in the East where intellectual activity had precedence over the desire for order and uniformity of a legal and disciplined type, which was the passion of Rome and of the West generally. Though dogma was not yet set forth in completely legal and authoritarian terms, nevertheless the passion of Rome for disciplined order had so far triumphed, and from now until the Revival of Learning there was little theological activity of any consequence. What followed was a great period of missionary activity and dogmatic evangelism with undisciplined growth of devotional practices.

## II.

The Scholastic Theology<sup>1</sup> had its occasion in the Revival of Learning and the consequent necessity of expressing the Christian message in the new thought-forms of Aristotelian philosophy. The Church of the West was still one, but within this Church there were the two great rival schools of Dominicans and Franciscans. It should always be remembered that the Western Catholic Church was nothing like so intransigent as the modern Roman Church. Theological opinions varied as between

one school and another, and the great Doctors of the Church were in their own day 'modernists,' as they always are in days of theological controversy—that is, they were attempting to express their Christian faith in the thought-forms of the modern world in which they lived, and refusing to adhere to out-worn shibboleths of a bygone age. They all, each in their turn, claimed liberty of expression against the traditional thought-forms of dogmatic decrees which they saw to be no longer serviceable. This was especially true of the greatest of them all—St. Thomas Aquinas, who set forth his teaching in the great *Summa*, which has ever since remained definitive for the Roman Church.

The passion of Aristotelian thought is for logical precision, and, broadly speaking, we may say that during this period doctrine became more logically formulated on the basis of the underlying idea that the relationship between God and the universe, including the kingdom of men, is one of a *legal* character. Theology became completely transactional, and this transactional character of doctrine has remained very permanent in Western Theology, both Catholic and Protestant. The wholly *personal* relationship of God to men was almost entirely lost sight of. Dogma (in the modern sense of the term) thus became of major importance, and its character was that of *supernaturally given truth*. The natural and the supernatural became sharply divided. Man by his natural reason (and the whole emphasis was on reason) was able to arrive at belief in God and in immortality, but could not have arrived at the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation. These were rational concepts which had to be supernaturally delivered, and could only be rejected on pain of death. No *natural* truth could be allowed to contradict what had been supernaturally delivered. By this time, too, the doctrine of Grace, in accordance with legal modes of thought, had assumed the form of a credit and debit balance system, and a whole Moral Theology with its system of casuistry was added to doctrinal theology proper. The sacrament of Penance was thoroughly elaborated and became the major sacrament of the Church. It was at this point, and almost at this point alone, that Protestantism in its classical form of Lutheranism broke with the Roman Church.

In any judgment we pass on Mediæval Christianity it must always be remembered that the Mediæval Church was entirely unlike the Primitive Church in one important respect. The Primitive Church came into a world which was highly civilized and cultured. It had nothing to contribute to the ancient world in the realm of culture—art, music,

<sup>1</sup> The great movements in the field of speculative theology, except the first, have reference to Western Christianity only. Orthodoxy was scarcely influenced at all by Scholastic Theology; it was only slightly influenced by Reformed Theology; and it is only now coming in contact with the theology of the Critical Period and making its own peculiar response, while at the same time it is producing, especially in the exiled Russian Church, its own Theology of Crisis.



politics, and so on. It existed as one of many societies within the State, often displaying the puritan attitude of complete separation from the State. The Mediæval Church, on the other hand, was the sole guardian of the relics of the culture of the ancient world. It was a missionary Church, and its missionaries came to the barbaric cultures of northern Europe with a tradition which was ripe in wisdom and powerful in discipline. The Church was the arbiter of the State's destiny, and the whole of life and culture were within her domain. The instrument of excommunication was the most powerful social and political force which the world has ever known. The world was adolescent and the Church was the nursing-mother<sup>1</sup> and more often the stern father. The intransigence of the Mediæval Church becomes most pronounced and evident in the field of authoritarian disciplinary action after the time of Aquinas, and heresy-hunting and martyrdom began to be common in the fourteenth century. The notion of salvation by orthodoxy had become supreme.

### III.

The Reformation theologies were occasioned, in the first place, by the new world which was produced by the revolutionary thought of the astronomers, explorers, and scientists. In the second place, it was occasioned by the corrupt state of the Roman Church which became plainly evident to a world no longer adolescent. In the third place, it was occasioned by the growth of nationalism, which was not a result of the Reformation but one of its causes.

The classical Reformation Theologies of Luther and Calvin differed little from the Mediæval Scholastic Theology, and this is even more true of the second generation of Lutherans and Calvinists. That of Zwingli differed in a more fundamental way. But one thing the Reformers had to do, and that was to break with the authority of the Church and so to give a new emphasis to the doctrine of private judgment. But once their systems were set up, private judgment was another matter. How far they were prepared to go with it is seen in Luther's treatment of the Anabaptists and Calvin's burning of Servetus, as well as in the Anglican persecutions of Roman Catholic and

Separatist disturbers of the national peace. Another thing which all the Reformers did was to break with the Roman system of moral theology which had become dreadfully corrupt. In its place they erected the doctrines of *sola fides* and *sola gratia*, which were equally capable of moral corruption. Another result of the Reformation was a fresh emphasis on Holy Scripture as the organ of authority, and the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular gave a fresh impetus to their study, which at first resulted in a certain measure of free treatment but which later actually gave rise to a new literalism. And a final thing which the Reformation did was to make Rome more intransigent. Definition of doctrine was increased and liberty of interpretation reduced. Christianity was henceforth divided into camps set over against each other. Each camp had to build up its walls of defence and to build them as high as possible. These walls were the great Confessions of Faith which were produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as The Tridentine Decrees (Rome), The Helvetic and Westminster Confessions (Reformed), The Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald Articles (Lutheran), The Thirty-Nine Articles (Anglican), and The Racovian Catechism (Socinian).

These all became standards of orthodoxy, and they differ entirely from the creeds of the Primitive Church in that dogma is no longer a set of given facts, but a set of given *opinions*, closely defined and logically coherent. In the main this system of doctrine remained authoritative until the close of the eighteenth century. Meantime, the new scientific age was producing its results, and in the realms of astronomy and physics changing the whole current of men's thought. The Churches were becoming more and more isolated from the main currents of life, and theology more and more remote from the ways of men's thought.

### IV.

The eighteenth century saw a great religious revival with emphasis on feeling and experience as over against reason and rational theology. Nevertheless the old dogmatic truths were the basis of the new experience as they remained the basis of nineteenth-century evangelicalism. But this new emphasis on experience gave rise to a new experiential theology in the work of Schleiermacher, and opened the way for a new critical inquiry. The scientific spirit had once more entered the field of theology and Biblical interpretation. The chief result of this new movement was to subject the

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps, as in the case of many nursing-mothers, the Church became the possessive-mother and refused to allow her children to grow up, with the inevitable result that some failed to grow up and remained the children of authority, whilst others rebelled and sought freedom and manhood away from her bosom.

Bible to an exhaustive critical inquiry, and to subject religion to both historical and psychological inquiry. The actual results may be summed up as follows :

1. The Bible came to be understood as a record of *progressive revelation* or *progressive discovery* in the field of religion. Eventually, in the extreme schools, discovery and revelation were regarded as one and the same thing.
2. The old literalism was broken down, and *historical* interpretation of the Bible was substituted for *textual* interpretation.
3. The Jesus of history assumed a new importance, and was rediscovered in a somewhat preferential and arbitrary treatment of the Synoptic Gospels which resulted in two sharply contrasted pictures, the Ethical Jesus and the Apocalyptic Jesus.
4. Jesus was sharply divided from St. Paul, who came to be regarded as the first perverter of the original Ethical Gospel of the Kingdom of God which was conceived of purely as a Kingdom of Social Righteousness. Paul had mistakenly deified Jesus, who had been the last and greatest of the ethical prophets whom Judaism had produced.
5. Religion came to be equated with the History of Religion and interpreted through the Psychology of Religion, and theology came to be regarded as a by-product of social forces.<sup>1</sup>
6. A new emphasis on *life* as over against *creed* became widespread, and moralism was substituted for religious dependence.
7. The Church and the Sacraments tended to become quite secondary and in the end almost irrelevant for Christian theology.
8. Finally the emphasis in religion became almost wholly subjective, with the result that toleration developed into 'anythingarianism.'

The above are broad generalisations, and there are many things which here must remain unsaid. But, whatever the results, theology had to pass through this stage and to be released from some of its old dogmatic manacles, in order that it might not only understand itself in the light of the new knowledge of the world which the scientific age had produced, but also in order that it might arrive

<sup>1</sup> Many exponents of this school failed to see that their own theology was equally condemned as a by-product of their own social environment. Others frankly recognized it and abandoned theology for religious humanism.

at a deeper understanding of the Faith in Christ which it sought to interpret. One thing this new movement did which was of permanent value—it put out of court for ever the old Biblical literalism and the *legal* interpretation of Christian doctrine.<sup>2</sup>

## V.

The last of the great movements in Theology (and we must speak with great caution about it, for it is a movement which is now in process) may be described as a movement away from liberalism towards orthodoxy, but orthodoxy at a deeper level ; and away from easy-going tolerance towards confessionalism, but confessionalism in the form of *essential witness* and *fundamental principles*. It is an attempt to lead away from all subjectivisms to what is objective. The transcendence of God is once again being emphasized over against immanence, and the Psychology of Religion and the History of Religion are no longer the arbiters of the Christian Faith. Philosophy and science have their place, but they are no longer the creators of the *credo*. And so far as philosophy and science are concerned we have to note that within their field there has been a most significant move away from materialism and mechanism towards a spiritual interpretation of the universe, so that the conflict between religion and science, in the sense in which it was understood in the nineteenth century, is almost a meaningless concept.

This last movement in the field of theology is the most complex of all, and there are many varying elements within it, so that it is difficult to describe. But we may say some things :

1. The new critical interpretation of the Bible is its basis and remains regulative. This position is accepted by all to-day except Roman Catholics (I mean officially) and extreme Evangelicals (Fundamentalists) who inhabit all the Protestant Churches and wholly embrace some of the smaller bodies.
2. The Word of God, which has received a new

<sup>2</sup> There was a parallel movement in America to that inaugurated in Europe by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. It had for its prophets men like Moses Stuart of Andover and, later, Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Va. Campbell, who was a Lockian in philosophy, reacted violently against literalism and legalism ; see his *Sermon on the Law*, delivered in 1816. Campbell had a large following, but unfortunately the second generation of his followers understood little of his aims and purposes.



emphasis, is not so much a *spoken* word as an *acted* word. What is important for theology is the Holy Action of God revealing to us His character and purpose.

3. This, of course, means that Revelation is never infallible in the sense in which it has been conceived to be in traditional Catholic and Protestant theologies, though it is infallible in a deeper sense. Man's search for an infallibility of the rigid, verbal, and legal type is a vain one. An infallible declaration of this kind would need an infallible mind to understand and interpret it. But an infallible mind is just the kind of mind which would have no need for such a declaration. The whole thing is a delusion and ought to worry us no longer. Both Judaism and Christianity are agreed that *in the absolute* God's ways are past finding out, but they both rely fully on the guidance of God in history, that is on Revelation. Theories of 'infallibility without limits' belong to those systems which are of the order of 'flights away from reality,' and both Judaism and Christianity are far too closely wedded to history—to what is actual—to find room for such theories. It is true that both Jewish and Christian Scholastic systems have propounded theories of 'infallibility without limits,' but such theories are really alien to the temper of both religions; and, paradoxically enough, they have been found to carry with them nothing but 'limits'—they have been the means of binding and not of loosing. When we realize that Revelation is divinely contrived but humanly conditioned, that we need training which will make us sensitive to values, that our limits set a limit on God in the sense of the measure in which He may be fulfilled in us, we do not rob ourselves of the idea of infallibility, but we arrive at a notion of infallibility as existential and concrete. This, if we like to call it so, may be described as 'infallibility with limits,' and it is just this kind of infallibility, which, paradoxically enough, carries with it no limits. And just for this reason it can never be completely conveyed in *verbal* form. At its highest it has for its vehicle the Divine Act. The words of the younger Isaac Penington are to the point here: 'All truth is a shadow except the last. But every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow

in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance.'<sup>1</sup>

4. There is a return to the primitive emphasis on dogmas as *given facts in history*, and on faith as *fiducia* and not *assensus*—a venturing out on life on the ground of certain deathless and uncontradictable actions of God within the sphere and meaning of history. This is coupled with the revival of the idea of the 'fulfilled time' or the 'ripe time' in history. The 'eternal now' of God is given in the 'crises' of history.
5. There is a new emphasis on the Church as an ontological reality, and as having meaning for history. The Church is closely identified with 'the true Israel,' 'the Remnant,' or 'the Little Flock,' which in history represents the level at which the heavenly and earthly planes intersect and at which 'over history' is shot down into history. With this emphasis on the Church goes a revived emphasis on the Sacraments and a new interest in worship which is concerned rather with its objective quality than with its subjective apparatus.
6. In many of the schools<sup>2</sup> within the movement there is a welcome emphasis on the *personal* action of God as over against *legal* and *mechanical* action. This is perhaps the deepest thing of all, and it means that God's Holy Action in creation and redemption is nothing other than God's bid for *fellowship*; so that the whole problem of freedom and authority takes on a new complexion as it is seen to be related to loyalty within

<sup>1</sup> Early in the third century Origen, through his study of the Fourth Gospel, had become aware of the need for a similar philosophy of Revelation in history. He declares that it was the purpose of the Evangelists 'to give truth where possible, both spiritually and corporeally, but when this was not possible, to prefer the spiritual to the corporeal, the true spiritual meaning being often preserved, so to speak, in the corporeal falsehood' (*Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, x. 4).

<sup>2</sup> It is a pity that this new movement in theology has come to be known almost solely in the form of Barthianism. Many people do not know that even in Germany Barth is only *one* amongst a number of leaders, such as Heim, Piper, and Tillich, and still less do they understand that the movement has its prophets elsewhere, such as Berdyaev in Orthodoxy, and the new Realistic theologians in America, and that von Hügel and P. T. Forsyth are just as significant as Karl Barth and much less hysterical and pathological.

a fellowship of love, and not to logic within a system of law.

So far as freedom and tradition in Christian thought are concerned, perhaps the one most important lesson we may learn from all this is that we shall never learn to set ourselves right within this whole business of freedom and tradition until, on the one hand, we set aside the whole paraphernalia

of *legal* ideas which have worked such havoc in Christian theology, and until, on the other hand, we learn the meaning of *loyalty* based on a love relationship. Then we shall discover that only within loyalty is freedom, that he is most free who is most loyal, for loyalty is freedom, and freedom means loyalty. We must learn to grow up and to be true sons and not slaves, nor even sons-in-law, in our Father's house.

## In the Study.

### *Virginitus Puerisque.*

Bridge-makers.

BY THE REVEREND RALPH F. CALDER, B.A., B.D.,  
GLASGOW.

HAVE you ever thought how really important bridges are? Perhaps you live in a city which is built on both sides of a river—then you will realize how long a time we should take if we had to wade or swim or take a boat or go along the bank until we could jump over the narrow stream near its source. And how dangerous it would be if every time a road and a railway line met, it could only be at a level crossing, and how tiresome having to wait for the gates to open! Bridges are most valuable things. They make for speed and comfort and safety, but most important they make for friendship, for they bring us closer together and so help us to know and understand each other.

Most of the bridges you will have seen will have been made of stone or steel or concrete or wood. But I want to tell you the strangest story of a bridge which was built on eggs.

Very nearly five hundred years ago there came to the throne of Bohemia, in the middle of Europe, a king called Charles the Fourth. He had a fine castle built on one bank of the river Vltava, separated from his capital city Prague by the strong flowing waters. If any one wished to go from the town to the palace, or the palace to the town, he had to use the ferry boat, and in winter-time the river ran so swiftly that the boat was sometimes swept away. So King Charles gave orders for a bridge to be built. Great stones were gathered together, and at last the work was finished. But the bridge stood up for a few months only, for the first flood waters from the hills swept it away. A second bridge was ordered and built, but it suffered the same fate, as did a third.

The King was much distressed and wondered what

to do. Then he had a bright idea. He issued a proclamation, commanding each of his subjects to bring to the riverside a basketful of eggs. This was done, and great piles of eggs were stacked up by the wondering men and women of Bohemia. Then the workmen were told to break up the eggs and mix into the sticky mess sand and gravel. If you have ever broken an egg in your hand you will have some idea of what a gluey mixture this would be. The result was embedded in the river and became the foundation of another bridge. The floods came that year, and have done ever since, but the bridge still stands after nearly five hundred years, one of the most beautiful, yet solidly built bridges in Europe.

A bridge built upon eggs! Little, frail common things, yet together linking two sides of a river that the people might cross over and understand and love each other.

Would you think me rude if I said that the story makes me think of you children? You are only small things in the great world of people. Yet you have built many mighty bridges together, and could build more. Are not the Boy Scouts and the Girl Guides and the Boys' Brigade like great bridges built between countries making for friendship and love between peoples?—and these are made up of tiny little contributions, like some of you here to-day. So are the world's Sunday schools, when the children think and pray about one another in different lands.

You would notice that I have no text—that is because the word bridge does not occur in the Bible, for there were no bridges in Palestine. But I think that if Jesus had heard our story He would have thought of you, and of how you could help towards the peace of the world by forming a bridge for understanding and love. We are to sing the hymn, 'Oh what can little hands do to please the King of



heaven?' What about trying to be a bridge-maker?

### Names and Nicknames.

BY THE REVEREND C. M. HEPBURN, B.D.,  
MOULIN, PITLOCHRY.

'What is thy name?'—Mk 5<sup>9</sup>.

Our Lord once asked a man that question. And the poor tormented creature replied, 'My name is Legion: for we are many.' It was a queer, but rather a fitting name, a name with a meaning. In the Bible there are many such. In general, Jewish parents did not select for their boys and girls just any sort of name, but as a rule tried to choose one that would be appropriate. Samson, you know, was a mighty man, but do you know that Samson means 'a strong man' too? Hannah, again, called her boy Samuel, that is, 'heard of God,' for God had heard and answered her prayer.

It was customary also among the Puritans to add special names to their own names afterwards, to describe their character. A list is given in an old book of some Puritans who lived in Sussex. All the names they chose contained Bible ideas, such as:

Fight-the-good-fight-of-faith White,  
Weep-not Billing,  
Peace-of-God Knight,  
Kill-Sin Pemble,  
Stand-Fast Stringer,  
More-Fruit Fowler.

I'm afraid that last one is rather like a green-grocer's advertisement, but the real meaning is not 'eat' more fruit, but 'bear' more fruit.

But even to-day some people take new names with a meaning. Particularly so when heathen people have become Christian. One of David Livingstone's loyal servants when he became Christian chose as his name Matthew Wellington, and he was as noble as his name; while recently a Chinese on turning Christian took the splendid name Wung-Chih-Wu, which, it appears, means 'determined to serve.'

Sometimes, again, people are given what we call nicknames. All nicknames are not bad ones. Sometimes a nickname can be a real compliment. A delightful old lady, who is ninety-one years of age, came to live in my parish lately, and I had the privilege of paying her a visit. She told me in a rich Scotch accent of the days when she was young. 'Ah,' she said, with a twinkle in her eye, 'in those days they used to call me Soople Hocky!' She

had been so supple on her feet. But I also know that these same feet had been 'swift and beautiful' for the King, and ever ready to go on His business. And here is another such name I heard of. A tombstone in a Lancashire village has this line upon it: 'Honest Adam Screed, Wheelwright.' It described both his work and his character. It was a name and a reputation well worth having. Honest Adam. And may I mention still one more. During my schooldays I often met an old blind woman. She was poor as well as blind. But she never seemed to give in to her troubles, and she usually had a laugh on her lips. She was always spoken of as 'Smiley Mary.' And when I think of it, that was a nickname she well deserved. Her real name, as a matter of fact, was Mary Hope, and that suited her too.

And now I wonder whether you've got a nickname, or what sort of one you would deserve? At any rate make up your mind that your conduct is going to be such that, if you are given one at all, it will be a good one. I can tell you of one that you could get. It is mentioned in a beautiful poem by William Blake:

'I have no name:  
I am but two days old.'  
What shall I call thee?  
'I happy am,  
Joy is my name.'  
Sweet joy befall thee!

And whether you are young or old you can win that name if you come to Jesus, for by doing His will and going His way, joy will be both your name and your nature.

If I come to Jesus,  
He will make me glad;  
He will give me pleasure  
When my heart is sad.

If I come to Jesus,  
Happy shall I be;  
He is gently calling  
Little ones like me.

### The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

#### The Magnetism of the Unseen.

'Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the fruit of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.'—1 P 1<sup>8</sup>. 9.

I fancy that many a Christian, encountering these words of Peter's—'whom having not seen'—would

answer at once, 'But I *have* seen Him! You can't shake my certainty of that. It is the very foundation of my personal religion, that Christ and I have met.' I think many of us would say that. And quite rightly. For if the unspoken demand that the Christian preacher hears from a congregation gathering in the Church for worship, is, 'Sir, we would see Jesus'; if he realizes that he has been ordained to his ministry, not to waste his time and theirs on genial generalities, but to do something to meet that demand for the vision of the Son of God—then it must be possible to see Christ still.

And yet—'whom having not seen,' says Peter. For, after all, none of us has seen Christ just as Peter saw Him. To Peter, as to the other disciples, Jesus had been a physical presence. I am sure the thought sometimes comes to us—'If I could have lived with Him as they did, could have consulted Him about the personal difficulties that make a tangle of my life, how much simpler life would have been!'

Dim tracts of time divide  
Those golden days from me;  
Thy voice comes strange o'er years of change;  
How can we follow Thee?

Comes faint and far Thy voice  
From vales of Galilee;  
Thy vision fades in ancient shades;  
How should we follow Thee?

But natural as such thoughts may be, they are really quite mistaken. One fact they are ignoring, the fact Paul fixed on when he said, 'Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more'; which means that what Calvary and the Resurrection did was to set the Spirit of Jesus loose in the world, untrammelled and alive for ever, freer actually than He ever was in the days of Galilee, and nearer now to His own than when they roamed together through the cornfields and the vineyards, or kept vigil beneath the Syrian stars.

And so we turn to the main burden of the Apostle's message. What he is trying to do here is something rather daring: it is nothing less than to define the central Christian experience in a single sentence; and you will observe that he has packed it all into four words, four short, decisive verbs: 'Ye love—ye believe—ye rejoice—ye receive.' That, he declares, is what it means to be a Christian. That, throughout the ages, has been the high road of salvation.

Let us examine this fourfold progression. First stands the verb '*Ye love*.' Now that immediately

suggests the question—What, in its essence, is the Christian religion?

Not a philosophy of life. Certainly it will give you a philosophy, for the faith of Jesus is ultimately the only thing that can make sense of the universe. But that is not what its essence is. You need more than a philosophy to hold you steady when the storms begin to blow, or when your dreams are lying wrecked, or when the demons of temptation have leapt upon your soul.

Not a moral code. Certainly it will provide you with that—the most sublime and noble ethic in the world. But that is not its essence. Men are not set on fire for God by anything so intolerably distant and impersonal as moral maxims and ethical idealisms.

Not a social creed. Certainly it will give you that: Christ has been behind more social reforms than any other leader who has ever appeared upon the earth. But that is not its essence. No amount of merely social passion can change lives or work the miracle of regeneration; and you cannot build the Kingdom of heaven out of men and women not redeemed.

The essence of Christ's religion is none of these things. It is a personal attachment. It is a response in love to the most fascinating Personality who ever walked this earth.

How can I choose but love Thee, God's dear Son,  
O Jesus, loveliest and most loving One?  
Were there no heaven to gain, no hell to flee,  
For what Thou art alone, I must love Thee.

Then the Apostle proceeds: 'In whom though now ye see him not, yet believing.' There is his second verb. Ye love, and—*ye believe*. Now it is this that keeps the love in Christianity from growing sentimental. For what is belief in Christ? What, for that matter, is belief in any one? It is *love going into action*. It is love staking its soul upon the worth of the one beloved. Kagawa of Japan was trying to explain what Christianity meant to him. 'I am God's gambler,' he cried. 'For Him I have wagered my last mite.' That is belief—not intellectual assent to a theory, but the throwing in of a life. In the stirring words of Martin Luther: 'The only faith which makes a Christian is that which casts itself on God for life or death.'

It is easy to see that, apart from this, love might degenerate into sentimentalism. There is a type of religion which sings, with suitable emotion, the love songs of the Church, without ever so much as giving a thought to what an old saint once called 'the stormy north side of Jesus Christ.'

To worship Christ, without bringing life into line



with such worship, is definitely more dangerous for a man's own soul than if he never worshipped at all. But the mark of Christian faith, says Peter, is not that it uses glowing love-language about Jesus: it is that it surrenders its life to the object of its love. Faith means being permeated with Christ's spirit. It means being captured by Christ's character. It means, as it meant to Christ, that you risk doing the will of God, even when there is a cross in it. Nothing sentimental about that love! It is strong with the strength of the eternal hills, and beautiful with the terrible beauty that once flamed up to God on Calvary.

Follow the Apostle's progress further. Ye love, ye believe, 'ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' Do you trace the connection? You love Jesus—that is first; and that love leads on to an offering of your life to Jesus—to belief and faith and irrevocable surrender; and that offering of life in turn produces a new kind of thrill never known before. For here is the great discovery you make: there is no joy on earth like the joy of being committed.

It is the swithering and undecided attitude that is dull and dreary and never sings. You cannot be happy—it is a psychological and spiritual impossibility—as long as you are refusing the daring of your own soul.

And if we could show the world to-day that being committed to Christ is no tame, humdrum, sheltered monotony, but the most fascinating and exciting adventure the human spirit can ever know—'joy unspeakable and full of glory'—then thousands of strong and stalwart lives that have been holding back from Christ and looking askance at the Church and standing outside the Kingdom would come crowding in to His allegiance; and there might be such a revival as the world has not witnessed since Pentecost.

This is no empty dream. There are signs now that the age is ripe for a great return to Christ. What are we witnessing throughout Europe and the world to-day? We are witnessing a demand for two things—a leader, and a cause. A living leader—not any longer a political theory or a revolutionary idea, but the theory incarnate in a man, the idea crystallized in a person, the word made flesh—that is what men are wanting: hence the hero-worship offered to-day to a Stalin, a Gandhi, a Hitler. And along with that, men demand a cause, something which will lay the most absolute claims upon them, something to which they can commit themselves sacrificially, body, mind, and soul. Nationalism and Communism may be at each other's throats, and their

conflict productive of chaos in the world; but at least they are alike in this, that each claims unhesitatingly a man's all, everything he has to give. That is what the spirit of the age is clamouring for—the leader who will readily lead, the cause that will challenge to sacrifice. And therefore, is not this the day of Christ's opportunity? It is high time we realized that it is no use setting a mild and undemanding half-Christianity against a militant, masterful paganism; no use setting some poor apologetic replica of Christ against the deified heroes of the age.

And now we take the last step with the Apostle. Ye love, ye believe, ye rejoice, 'ye receive the salvation of your souls.' The word 'salvation' is like the Cross that purchased it: it reaches up to heaven, and goes down to hell, and its arms embrace the world. For the past, it brings forgiveness; for the present, the power of the Spirit; and for the future, life for evermore.

And, says Peter, ye receive it. You do not win it, for no man can do that. You do not earn it, for it is not a wage. You do not buy it, for it is not for sale. You receive it. You bow your head, with pride all broken down, and take the gift from Jesus' hand.<sup>1</sup>

### THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

#### Triumph of Righteousness: An Address to Boys.

'Follow me.'—Lk 9<sup>59</sup>.

If ever there were a defeatist slogan, surely it was this one. Admitted that Jesus was only at the outset of His ministry; admitted that His cry was backed up by all the power and influence of a young idealist, whose character was wonderful and magnificent and unique: none the less, one moment's thought would suffice to show its utter madness. The battle-cry was uttered by a village workman in an insignificant, remote, subjugated Roman province. It challenged every system of law in the world—the political law, the religious law, the moral law. It had no men of might on its side. He who uttered it was an unknown carpenter. They who heard it were men and women of the humblest working-class type—boatmen, ploughmen, peasants, shepherds, housewives, profligates, and prostitutes. If they responded to the call *en masse*, doubled the number so gained, trebled them, quadrupled them—a single Roman cohort would have sufficed to disperse them utterly and hopelessly.

The battle-cry of faith has always been raised by, or in the presence of, an apparently impotent

<sup>1</sup> J. S. Stewart, *The Gates of New Life*, 123.

minority. What men believe is so often what their parents, their class, their nation believe. It is only a tiny number in each age who, venturing out upon the raft of a personal faith, have found in their faith their life, and cried : ' I live—yet not I, Christ liveth in me.'

It is remarkable how we worship size in Nature and politics and religion. Yet size has never been the really influential element in human life. Was it not Mr. Einstein who said not very long ago that if two per cent. only of the people would declare themselves firmly against war in any shape or form, war would cease ? And he is right : for it is the minorities which always win. They won in the matter of freedom of worship, of freedom of the slaves, of personal liberty, of the rights of man, of children in the chimneys, in the factories, in the mines. One of the greatest teachings of history is : distrust mass opinion ; turn to the few who are standing out against it.

The story of mankind is full of amazing examples of this truth. What made a Grenfell, a Schweitzer, a Livingstone, a Wilberforce, a Thring, a Paton, but that ? All of them were prepared to live a good ordinary life full of zest and pleasure. But they heard the call : ' Follow me and I will make you '—and what did He not make them ? They had their zest and their pleasure ; but their life, because not given to self-pleasing, was not ordinary ; it had that extraordinary quality which comes to men whose lives have ceased to be ego-centric and have become Christo-centric.

So when in your future occupations you find wire-pulling and palm-greasing, wangling and scrounging, do not make the mistake that such methods can ever succeed. Because the majority rules to-day is the last possible reason why it should rule always. If you wish to be progressive, you will have to start your progress in a minority of one somewhere—no truth in life is more assured than that. Apply the magnet of truth to any age, any era, any civilization ; you will find that the hope of that age is in its intelligent, thinking, active minorities.

The scholarship of Montesquieu's *Considerations on the Grandeur and the Decadence of the Romans* has long been left far behind ; but the luminous, broad, deliberate consideration of the causes why Rome, which had been so mighty, fell so utterly, is as valuable to-day as it ever was. And the great Frenchman comes step by step and slowly to his conclusion that Rome smashed because of her inconsiderate and thoughtless acceptance of the majorities principle ; she produced opulent patricians, but she did not produce the kind of in-

dividual citizen who could bring fresh thought and life to the Empire.

To-day there is another great empire of which we are members—the great British commonwealth of nations. And to each of us do the words spoken by one of our poets laureate come with significance :

You, you, if you shall fail to understand  
What England is, and what her all in all,  
On you will come the curse of all the land  
Should this old England fall.

But England will not fall so long as it breeds citizens who bring thought and creative life to its assistance. Let us speak of one of them.

Just over one hundred years ago there was born an Englishman, Hudson Taylor, whose greatest saying was that God's work contained three stages : (1) Impossible ! (2) Difficult ! (3) Done ! Hudson Taylor started the China Inland Mission in 1865, ' to plant the standard of the Cross in the eleven provinces of China not yet occupied, and in Chinese Tartary.' Amid incredible difficulties that mission slowly grew. To-day the mission he began has 1300 missionaries at work in practically every province, all in unknown places in China, and over five million pounds has been spent by it without one single appeal for funds. ' You must be conscious of the wonderful way God has prospered you in the C.I.M., ' some one remarked to Taylor one day. ' I do not look at it that way,' was his answer. ' I sometimes think that God must have been looking for some one small enough and weak enough for Him to use, so that all the glory might be His, and that He found me.'

' Whose faith follow.' Whenever we hear that call we move across from the crowd, the herd, the main mass of men, into the sacrificial minority which sees a better world and decides it can do no other than create some portion of it.

Following the Teacher of Galilee, a man finds a new power and a new glory in all he does. Faced with a big job, an impossible job, he finds the impossible changes into the difficult, and the difficult into the done, the accomplished, the finished work for which his life was intended and fore-ordained. To his own amazement, as much as that of all who know him, he exults : ' I, muddle-headed, blundering I, am more than conqueror over this riddle of existence through Him that hath loved me.'

Stand then in His great might,  
With all His strength endued ;  
But take, to arm you for the fight,  
The panoply of God ;



That, having all things done,  
And all your conflicts passed,  
Ye may o'ercome through Christ alone,  
And stand entire at last.<sup>1</sup>

#### FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

##### Fearfulness.

'I will hear what God the Lord will speak.'—Ps 85<sup>a</sup>.

On nearly every subject affecting our duty or our happiness we are mightily confused.

Consider the sources of this confusion. For one, there is what seems to us to be an almost unbridgeable gulf between the splendour and the baseness of men and women like ourselves. If we pick up any newspaper the proof stares us in the eyes. In one column one reads of four old gentlemen in Japan done to death by hooligans dressed in uniform. In the next, a train fireman, blinded, gasping, crazed with pain, stumbles through scalding steam to reach the controls and brakes, reaches them and pulls, and delivers a hundred lives. And, as we read, the page is bright with glory. In another a poor tramp leaps into a raging flood after a baby girl, and brings her to land. But, in the magnificent sentence of the evangelist, 'himself he cannot save.' Underneath and in the same column a mother drowns her child. The insurance was worth £10. So that the cry that breaks from our lips is the tortured cry of Nicodemus, 'How can these things be?' How does it come about that the tiger and the ape inhabit one body and the hero and the saint another? How do they both inhabit the same body? How can the school and the church and the newspaper and Parliament manufacture heroes and saints? How and by what magic can they slay the animal that lurks in us? Or can we be lifted into a higher life of self-reverence and self-control only by a higher power? The moment a man sets himself these problems, he is as desolate as any sailor lost without helm and compass upon a waste of sea. Or the injustices that are all about us confuse our thought. Or the divided aims we find struggling for victory within ourselves. Or, most mysterious of all, the seeming inactivity of God. Why doesn't He send some consuming flame into the hearts of the nations and burn us clean of our hatred and stupidities and reliance on force: burn and burn and burn till these are in ashes for ever?

'God does nothing,' Carlyle muttered, and turned to the wall and died. And in her biography of Lord Salisbury, his daughter tells that, for the same

reason, her father's soul was fast bound in misery and iron. 'God is all-loving,' he cried, 'and all-powerful. And the world is as it is. How are you going to explain that?' Explain, indeed! Why, if we are honest and have any stuff of courage in our conscience, we say out at once that we cannot explain it, and that a modern singer puts our case exactly:

It darkens. I have lost the ford,  
The rocks have evil faces, Lord,  
And I am awfully afraid.

The result? The result is that we are bewildered and miserable. Our mind keeps losing its way. We flounder along among the bogs of doubt and guesses. Or worse. We grope through a night in which the stars of hope and faith are black and out.

Is there anything fairer than a June morning? Or sweeter than a child's smile? Or more purifying than a true love? There is. And it is this. The discovery that we may be quit of our amazements and darkness and agony of thought for ever. And this when by God's kindness we are made to see that our confusions are of our own making. It is our fault. It is not God's. So far from wishing that we should be the slaves of fear, it is the aim and passion of God's love and Christ's mind that we should be kings and queens in spirit; that we should talk and work in the light; that we should breathe the bracing air of His truth; that we should feel His very Self in us, armour and cordial both; that we should remain simple and pure and glad and free, however busy and crowded the hour; and that the life-force that is in His Son's spirit should pulse and quicken ours. 'I am come,' the Saviour said, 'that you may have life—life; light; happiness; guidance; the joy of knowing that I love you; the power of health in all your thinking; the power of rightness in all your choices. This is the life I offer you, and the way of life everlasting.'

The road to this life and power is the road the Psalmist takes. He does a very simple, beautiful and efficient thing. And that is this. He permits God to speak to him. 'I will hear,' he says, 'what God the Lord will speak.' I will bring my mind to His Overmind. Here, if we will have it, is the secret of escape. Here is the way out of our confused thinking. Let us rest our spirit for ten minutes each day in His society. Be apart with Him. Be reverent. Be humble. Be still. Ask Him, as Jesus did, to speak. But remember there will be no dramatic miracle. If there is worry in the home or in our heart, we will not find that God is a magic wind to blow it clean away. But, for all that, one will still be a wonder to oneself. For we will find a new

<sup>1</sup> S. H. Moore, 'Wherewithal . . .', III.

strength added to our will, a new clearness to our thought, a new pity to our judgment; and a new power to love, vibrant and victorious within our mind. And so a dream will come true. We will be made quiet. And enriched and enlarged.

In Miss Strickland's life of Queen Elizabeth we see a wise woman sometimes. Always a very vain one. Often revoltingly cruel. All three, and yet the breath of greatness was in her too. Before the Armada sailed, she spoke words to her Parliament that brayed like a thousand trumpets through the land. 'I have the body of a weak and feeble woman,' she flashed, 'but I have the heart of a king.' The mounting pride of race flames through her claim. But we who are Christ's men and women stand upon a rock that yields a confidence stronger and quieter still. Which is that, with the Christ-faith in us, we may always enter into a Divine presence, and hear a Divine voice, and come forth with a Divine strength to be our Divine selves, and with power in us to do the Divine will.

So in the heart that knows Thy love, O Saviour,  
There is a temple sacred evermore,  
And all the tumult of life's angry voices  
Dies in hushed silence at its peaceful door.  
O rest of rests, O peace, serene, eternal,  
Thou ever livest and thou changest never,  
And in the secret of Thy presence dwelleth  
Fulness of joy for ever and for ever.<sup>1</sup>

#### FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

##### Have you Answered the Door?

'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock.'—Rev 3<sup>20</sup>.

The text recalls a verse in the Song of Songs, which in all probability inspired the picture that is given here. 'It is the voice of my beloved, saying, Open to me, my love, for my head is filled with dew and my locks with the drops of the night.' And, while this was but a fragment of a human love-song, it won its title to be called inspired. It found its way into the Bible, because the Bible is, above all else, the book of the heart. It is Divine because it is in the deepest and highest sense human; just as Jesus Himself is 'the Highest and most human too.'

With the text the message to the churches is at an end, and the final appeal is to the individual soul. Christ is represented as standing at the door of every human heart, knocking for entrance. That is the picture with which we are most familiar. The Christian preacher and artist of a generation ago

<sup>1</sup> A. Maclean, *Walk in the Light*, 160.

were able to use it with more effect than it is being used to-day. Something has happened to turn the point of its appeal. The literal and matter-of-fact attitude of the modern mind has little time for mystical interpretations. If we tried a different line of approach, perhaps, we might find the point again. 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock.'

Let us take the words in their ordinary natural sense, as if they were a true account of our relations one with another, as, indeed, they are. We are all standing and knocking at one another's doors, baffled by the barriers of silence and secrecy that lie between. An English officer, writing of his experiences during the War, and thinking especially of the comradeship that was possible under those conditions, living in freedom from ordinary conventions, sleeping in tents or in the open, side by side with his men, under the stars, says: 'What a wide human fellowship we are shut out from by the man who first invented a door!' We usually think of a door as a symbol of our security; we seldom think of it as a symbol of our insularity. It shuts us in with one another as members of a family; it may have the effect of shutting us out from a much wider human fellowship.

But even within the same family one member may be shut out from fellowship with the others. This is the door of personality. After a certain age, when we become self-conscious, it is closed for the most part, except to our nearest and dearest, and even to them it is not always open. Walter Pater once said that 'each individual was ringed round by that thick wall of personality through which no real voice has ever pierced on its way to him, able only to conjecture that which may be without.'

Yet personality is the one thing we can really know, though we understand it least of all. We say we know things, but we don't. We know them only in their relation to other things. We cannot know matter, because it is not real enough, because it has no inner core or unity to respond to our personality. We can only appeal to that which has an inner life of its own and is capable of response. Our dogs, for instance, may respond to us in a sort of way, but only up to a point can we have knowledge of them or they of us. It is only personality that can respond to personality; it is only the living that the living can really know. Only personal spirit can respond to personal spirit.

Yet, with it all, with all this marvellous capacity for knowledge of one another, this power of responding heart to heart, what miserably lonely isolated and insulated creatures we mortals usually are! How seldom do we allow ourselves to be to others



what we really are. Our real life is not necessarily the life we live: our deepest thoughts are not necessarily the thoughts we speak.

Just the other day the wife of a man who had died wrote to her husband's friend to tell him of the death, and added: 'He never became unconscious, but said nothing about himself. I often wondered what was in his mind, but I could not bring myself to ask him.' That is the tragedy of the closed door.

There is a sense in which we are locked in by our self-made habits, and the power to unlock and open the heart must be of Christ Himself, although He may use some one else to help us open the door to Him. When we do open to Him and He comes in, we realize the importance of the active as against the passive aspect of our inner life. We realize that our personality is not simply a self-contained, self-sufficing centre of life, waiting to be assailed, but that it is an Active Will, a living, urgent presence that must go out of itself and enter into the lives of others to realize itself; a striving spirit, calling and responding out of the dark to the call of other spirits.

In that book of biography, *The Men of the Knotted Heart*, a story is told of Grant of Greenock, as he was familiarly known, how one Saturday night he arrived to preach at a mining village near Wishaw. Not knowing the way to the manse, he stopped at a cottage to ask. A woman came to the door and, seeing a minister standing there at that time of night, she was suddenly seized with terror and screamed, babbling something he could not make out. It was some time before he could make her realize that nothing was wrong and, when she became calm, she explained that her husband was working in a nearby coal-pit on the night-shift, and

a minister's appearance at her door at that late hour immediately suggested to her mind that he was the bearer of bad news. It was a revelation to Grant of what may be on the other side of any door. What an agony of anxiety in that cry!

Yes, and there are worse things than these going on behind many a door, terrible things, shameful things, tragedies too deep for words. The news of a suicide, especially of one we knew, makes us feel uncomfortable. But what are we doing to prevent these happenings?

As Dr. J. H. Jowett once said: 'It is not only Christ who stands at the door and knocks. It is true of every one who has fellowship with Him. We must go where He goes and stand where He stands.'

Yet there is nothing we can do until the door of our own need has been thrown open. It is to this end that Christ stands and knocks.

The moment we open our hearts to Him, He comes in and takes possession. He will, then, answer the door for us to every knock that comes, be it friend or foe, good thought or bad thought. He will know whom or what to admit and whom or what to reject. And of this we may be sure, that 'nothing that defileth or that maketh a lie' will ever enter in. What a joy to any who come to us in trouble or distress, who knock at our door for help, to find that it is Christ Himself who answers the door! A door that used to be closed against Him and against others, a door which now can never be shut. There is no force in all the world so likely as interceding prayer to keep open our own door and to open the doors of others to the joy and fullness of the Presence of Him who stands and knocks.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E. Macmillan, *Finding and Following*, 47.

## The Epistle of St. James.

BY THE REVEREND H. G. MEECHAM,<sup>1</sup> M.A., B.D., PH.D., HARTLEY VICTORIA COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

I. LANGUAGE AND STYLE.—No traces of an Aramaic original were found, though there are occasional evidences of a Semitic, if not definitely

Hebraic, thought-background. The absence of the article in 1<sup>20</sup> is a case in point. Hort here translates, 'a petty passion of an individual soul,'

<sup>1</sup> [In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October 1936, some findings on the First Epistle of St. Peter reached by corporate study in the Hellenistic Seminar of Manchester University were presented. A similar summary of the discussion on the Epistle of St. James is here given. The substance of this synopsis was

drawn up by Dr. J. A. Findlay, the chairman. Dr. H. McLachlan, the secretary, recorded the summary, embodying certain modifications by the members. At the Editor's request and by authorization of the Seminar, Dr. H. G. Meecham has revised and prepared the statement for publication.]

but the phrase has a Semitic colouring. In the case of ἀκροατῆς ἐπιλησμονῆς (1<sup>25</sup>) the Seminar was disinclined to allow a Semitism, He 3<sup>12</sup> and Lk 18<sup>6</sup> being quoted. He 3<sup>12</sup> is the more nearly parallel, as Lk 18<sup>6</sup> has the article and may mean 'the judge typical of this unrighteous order' (cf. Lk 16<sup>8,9</sup>). Ja 3<sup>13</sup> offers another possible instance of Semitic genitive (cf. Wis 1<sup>10</sup>, *Aristeas* 59 al., *Enoch* 10<sup>16</sup>).<sup>1</sup> Other points significant in this respect are the thrusting forward of τῶν ἱππων (Ja 3<sup>3</sup>), the first clause of 3<sup>1</sup>, and the position of πάντες (3<sup>2</sup>). Some members urged that the instances in 3<sup>2,3</sup> were normal Greek, and attention was called to the variant reading in 3<sup>1</sup>. It was agreed that the case for possible Semitisms might be discussed afresh, as the matter has an important bearing upon the question of authorship. Ac 15<sup>17</sup> may be compared with Ja 2<sup>7</sup> in this connexion. It was noted that Ac 15<sup>17</sup>, whilst put in the mouth of James, is from the LXX, and that speeches in Acts seem to have been edited or composed by Luke.

The Greek of the Epistle is good Hellenistic and comes behind only the Epistle to the Hebrews and the preface to St. Luke's Gospel in point of correctness. Ropes declares even the usage in 2<sup>15</sup> (the plural of the verb with two singulars connected by ἦ) to be in accord occasionally with that of good Greek writers. αὐτῇ for τοῦτο has respectable parallels (1<sup>27</sup>). Fusion of strong and weak aorists is entirely absent from the Epistle, and if ἴστε (1<sup>10</sup>) is Indicative (as R.V.) we have evidence of literary culture; οἶδατε, however, occurs in 4<sup>1</sup>. Clearer evidence of education in the literary sense may be found in the use of such words as βρῶν (here only in the Greek Bible), κάμνω (Wis., 4 Mac., He., and literate papyri), and εὐπειθής (4 Mac. and legal documents). Δίψυχος (1<sup>8</sup> 4<sup>8</sup>) is probably a coinage of the writer.<sup>2</sup> The use of tenses is often subtle, and shows an easy mastery of Greek (cf. 1<sup>23-25</sup>). Whether hexametric or tetrametric rhythm underlies 1<sup>17</sup>, its literary beauty is unmistakable. Other noteworthy passages are 1<sup>6-8</sup> 3<sup>15-18</sup>.

II. SUBJECT-MATTER.—The influence of Philo is very apparent. In 1<sup>26, 27</sup> 3<sup>6</sup>, however, the nearest parallels to connexions of thought are Rabbinic. On the whole the Seminar did not think that the polemical passage 2<sup>18-26</sup> necessarily presupposed

the Epistle to the Romans, as 'faith *versus* works' was a stock subject of discussion in the synagogues of the period. The connexion between Ja 1<sup>22</sup> and Ro 2<sup>13</sup> is very close, however, though it is significant that where Paul has νόμου James has λόγου. The reading of Irenæus on James (*loc. cit.*), 'doer of words' (i.e. words of Jesus) was mentioned, and the Seminar was inclined to look for dependence rather on Q (cf. Mt 7<sup>24-27</sup>, Lk 6<sup>47-49</sup>) than on Paul for such ideas as these. Coincidences with the teaching of Jesus are more numerous and striking than is the case in any other New Testament epistle—a fact that gives the Epistle its special interest and value. The following are some of the more suggestive: Ja 1<sup>2</sup> (Mt 5<sup>10-12</sup>, Lk 6<sup>22, 23</sup>) 1<sup>4</sup> (Lk 21<sup>10</sup>) 1<sup>6</sup> (Mt 7<sup>7</sup>, Lk 11<sup>9</sup>) 1<sup>6</sup> (Mk 11<sup>23</sup>, Mt 21<sup>21</sup> διακρινέσθαι) 1<sup>8</sup> (Mt 14<sup>31</sup>) 1<sup>9, 10</sup> (Mt 23<sup>13</sup>, Lk 14<sup>11</sup>) 1<sup>17</sup> (Mt 7<sup>11</sup>, Lk 11<sup>5-8</sup>) 1<sup>21</sup> (Lk 8<sup>8</sup>—note the connexion between the implanted word and salvation in both passages), 1<sup>22ff.</sup> (for νόμον τέλειον, cf. such teaching as Mt 7<sup>12, 17, 19, 22</sup>) 1<sup>27</sup> (Mt 25<sup>31ff.</sup> ἐπισκεπτέσθαι), 2<sup>5</sup> (Mt 5<sup>3</sup>, Lk 6<sup>20</sup>) 2<sup>7</sup> (Mk 9<sup>41</sup>) 2<sup>10</sup> (Mt 5<sup>10</sup>) 2<sup>13</sup> (Mt 5<sup>7, 18, 30</sup>) 2<sup>14</sup> (Mt 7<sup>21</sup> 21<sup>18ff.</sup>, Lk 6<sup>46</sup>) 3<sup>1</sup> (Mt 23<sup>8, 10</sup>, Lk 12<sup>47ff.</sup>) 3<sup>2</sup> (Mt 12<sup>36, 37</sup>) 3<sup>6</sup> (Mt 15<sup>11, 18, 19</sup>, Mk 7<sup>15ff.</sup>—the defiling tongue) 3<sup>12</sup> (Mt 7<sup>16</sup>) 3<sup>13</sup> (Mt 5<sup>16</sup>) 3<sup>18</sup> (Mt 5<sup>9</sup>) 4<sup>1</sup> (Lk 6<sup>26</sup>, Mt 6<sup>24</sup>) 4<sup>9</sup> (Lk 6<sup>21, 25</sup>) 4<sup>17</sup> (Lk 12<sup>47</sup>—it was suggested that this may be an aragphon, as Ephrem quotes it from Tatian's *Harmony*. The Bezan addition at Lk 6<sup>5, 6</sup> was cited as a parallel in thought) 5<sup>1</sup> (Lk 6<sup>24</sup>) 5<sup>2</sup> (Mt 6<sup>19</sup>, Lk 12<sup>33</sup>) 5<sup>6</sup> (Mt 23<sup>35</sup>, Lk 11<sup>51</sup>) 5<sup>7</sup> (Mk 4<sup>26ff.</sup>) 5<sup>10</sup> (Mt 5<sup>12</sup>) 5<sup>12</sup> (Mt 5<sup>33ff.</sup>; cf. 2 Co 1<sup>17, 18</sup>), 5<sup>14</sup> (Mk 6<sup>13</sup>) 5<sup>15</sup> (Mk 2<sup>4, 5</sup> and parallels). An interesting parallelism or contrast may be noted between the teaching about to-day and to-morrow, Mt 6<sup>34</sup> and Ja 4<sup>13ff.</sup> On the whole, the Seminar agreed with Zahn's verdict that the didactic style of James is second only to that of Jesus in point of trenchancy and pith. The language is sometimes that of the Rabbinic schools (e.g. Ja 2<sup>18ff.</sup>), but there are equally clear traces of the influence of the Greek diatribe and even of the style of the New Comedy (Ja 5<sup>13ff.</sup>).

The Seminar found nothing that compelled a date later than the sixth decade of the first century A.D. for the composition of the Epistle. If τὸν δίκαιον (5<sup>6</sup>) be James himself (the members inclined to take the phrase in a general sense) the book in its present form must have been written after A.D. 62. No decisive evidence one way or the other was found. If the writer used our Gospels, the Epistle must have been comparatively late. But as the only saying (Ja 5<sup>12</sup>; cf. Mt 5<sup>33ff.</sup>) that does not come from any generally acknow-

<sup>1</sup> See J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 74, 235. Also W. F. Howard (in Moulton, *Gram.*, ii. 440), in whose full note the New Testament instances are conveniently marshalled and further references given.

<sup>2</sup> Analogous formations elsewhere made it an easy coinage. The word is frequent in Hermas and early Christian literature.



ledged Q also underlies 2 Co 1<sup>17, 18</sup>, where there can be no question of the use of one of our Gospels, we must assign it also to some collection of the sayings of Jesus, unless it is personal reminiscence. If James, the Lord's brother, really was the preacher, we might regard the Epistle as a first-hand source for the teaching of Jesus. This is by no means out of the question.

Attention was paid to what has been called the diluted Christianity of the Epistle in the light of Dr. J. H. Moulton's theory that it was meant to present the ethical teaching of Jesus to non-Christian Jews in a form which would offer the fewest possible hindrances to their acceptance of it. In this connexion Ja 2<sup>1</sup> was felt to be important, and the interesting suggestion was made that we should read Χριστοῦ closely with τῆς δόξης. After a long discussion the Seminar inclined to the view that the words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ have been interpolated to give the Epistle a more canonical look. The parallel of the Christian additions to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was adduced. The members were not so clear concerning the same words in 1<sup>1</sup>, though perhaps their omission also should logically follow. Even if the words are allowed to stand in both places, the rarity of the name was felt to be important. Careful investigation of the distinction between κύριος and ὁ κύριος was seen to be necessary. The word is used five times without the article and nine times with it. Ja 1<sup>1</sup> appears to be the only place where it is used for Christ without the article—perhaps a slight argument against the authenticity of the words Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Of the instances where the article is used five refer to Yahweh, three to Christ, and one (4<sup>15</sup>) might be either. In Matthew and Mark κύριος generally means Yahweh, ὁ κύριος = Jesus. In Luke the usage is much less uniform; ὁ κύριος = Jesus seventeen times, Yahweh nine times, and the proportions are nearly the same for Acts. In John ὁ κύριος always

means Jesus. In all New Testament writers except Luke, the rule κύριος = Yahweh, ὁ κύριος = Jesus seems to hold good, though Old Testament quotations produce disturbance in the usage. Even in Ja 1<sup>7</sup> 4<sup>15</sup>, ὁ κύριος might conceivably stand for Jesus, and 5<sup>11</sup> is an Old Testament quotation. A similar investigation into the usage of νόμος and ὁ νόμος yielded the following results. The word is used without the article six times in the Epistle, with the article twice only. In the two instances with the article the phrase obviously stands for the Law of Moses (2<sup>9, 10</sup>); in four of the six occurrences without the article the Seminar saw a reference to the 'law' of Christ (1<sup>25</sup> 2<sup>8, 12</sup> 4<sup>11</sup>). In 2<sup>11</sup> παραβάτης νόμου may be thought of as practically equivalent to rebel. No uniform usage of this sort appears to be discernible in the New Testament, but the idea of the two laws is everywhere present in the First Gospel.

The conclusion would seem to be that we have in the Epistle a series of addresses or fragments of addresses delivered in Palestine, then edited and worked over by a Hellenist student of Philo. Dr. J. H. Moulton's theory that a Christian is here appealing to non-Christian Jews does not seem to account for the polemic in Ja 2<sup>14π</sup>. There would seem to be little point in a Christian championing works *versus* faith to a Jewish audience. On the other hand, the theory that James is here attacking or replying to Paul likewise seems not proven. It is possible, however, that he has in mind such perversions of the Pauline doctrine as were current when, for example, Ro 3<sup>31</sup> was written. No very late date is needed for such an abuse of the idea underlying Ro 4<sup>5</sup> to need correction. Paul and James in this regard might be thought of rather as parallel developments than as cause and effect. Apart from this passage the Seminar found little guidance in the dating of the Epistle. Ja 5<sup>14</sup> can be paralleled by Mk 6<sup>13</sup>, and a Palestinian climate seems presupposed in 4<sup>7</sup>.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### The Theology of the Gospels.

THESE two pamphlets<sup>1</sup> are special reprints from the *Theologische Blätter* (Theological Pages). The

<sup>1</sup> *Die Eschatologie der Evangelien; ihre Geschichte und ihr Sinn*, von Professor Werner Georg Kümmel; *Johanneisches Denken*, von Walther von Loewenich (Heinsiches Verlag, Leipzig; M.1.80 each).

first (Nos. 9 and 10) deals with 'The Eschatology of the Gospels, its History and Meaning'; and the second (No. 11) with 'Johannine Thought,' and is described as 'A contribution to the recognition of Johannine peculiarity.' They may be dealt with together.

(1) Professor Kümmel in four pages discusses the interpretations which have been given before

stating his own conclusions from the study of the historical development in the New Testament. It may be assumed that Jesus did continue the Baptist's call to repentance in view of coming judgment, but what He chiefly preached was that God's sovereignty was near; and, although He here took up a Jewish thought. He was not interested in the catastrophic occurrences expected, but in God's action in all its power, apart from all nationalist hopes. He did not describe the salvation of that sovereignty in any detail; but His emphasis lay here, as He claimed to be preaching the gospel. This saving sovereignty, while still future, is being already anticipated in Jesus' presence and activity. Eschatology thus becomes Christology. All changes in the eschatology of the primitive Christian churches are accordingly bound up with the development of the Christology.

The experience of the primitive community of the resurrection of Jesus, of His heavenly activity, and of present salvation, strengthened the conviction of the presence of the divine sovereignty as an anticipation of the end; and even the apocalyptic ideas were transformed by the central position of Christ. Paul's preaching was essentially a preaching of Christ, and his eschatology was a development of that of Jesus, due to the realities of Easter and Whitsuntide. While recognizing the emphasis in the Fourth Gospel on the present salvation in Christ, the author insists that the current eschatology as here preserved must not be regarded as an alien element inserted by an editor, but as an essential part of the teaching. The apparent contradictions he resolves by asserting that 'the Gospel of John undertakes the bold attempt to expound the faith in the divine dignity of Jesus Christ in the form of a historical narrative of the life of a man' (p. 26). Accordingly, the belief in the historical revelation in Christ demands a future as well as a present, in short an eschatology. While for us belief in the details and the immediacy of this eschatology is impossible, yet we too must have a belief that God's saving sovereignty in Christ will have a historical consummation. This pamphlet offers a careful and trustworthy exegetical basis for the Christian hope and can be confidently commended.

(2) Docent von Loewenich's pamphlet equally deserves appreciative attention. At the start he insists on the originality of the Johannine writings and the abandonment of the Pauline interpretation. He sets aside several modes of approaching an understanding, such as the Gnostic, the philosophical idealist, according to which historical facts

are resolved into eternal truths, and the symbolic, which resolves this history into truths, and not realities. While an allegorical exegesis is in some cases more realistic than a historical; yet for the author of this literature truth has become reality. 'The myth in the form of reflection becomes a metaphysic' (p. 8). To this higher realism the sacramental interpretation also points.

The peculiarity of Johannine thought needs to be constantly remembered. The contrast to the Synopes and Paul makes this apparent. The thinking is not logical, but contemplative, a meditation on the pregnant vision of Christ. No strict arrangement is, or can be, here followed. It is organic in growing out of its object, around which the mind is spirally moving; there is repetition and yet advance; ideas overlap as all relate to the one theme. The conceptions are absolute as they refer to ultimate reality, the last words of truth. Convinced of the actuality of the events the Evangelist records that for him is secondary to the symbolic significance. Unlike Kümmler, von Loewenich maintains that eschatology in the writings falls into the background. The pamphlet concludes by an examination of characteristic Johannine conceptions to illustrate this peculiarity of thinking. It is the duty of theology and Church, the author insists, to take this peculiarity more seriously. So taken, one of the most precious treasures of the Bible will be found in the Johannine writings. One is glad to meet with positive critical writings.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

## Maria.

The current issue of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Töpelmann, Berlin; Band 14, Heft 1-2) contains material which is even more varied than usual. The first article is an essay, by the veteran W. Staerk, on the Old Testament doctrine of election, in which the author traces first the belief in the choice of special persons—Israel as a people, its king, and its priests, and then the selection of the one site on which sacrifice might be offered, calling attention to the divergent theories represented by Deuteronomy and by the priestly writings. Hänel, already well known in this country for his work on Chronicles, discusses the sacrificial laws presupposed in that book, with special reference to the part played by priests, levites, and the laity, in the actual offering of the victim, and draws attention to an ancient Midrashic



tradition embedded in the book. Several articles are more closely concerned with exegesis. Munch contributes a discriminating study of the problem of wealth as approached in Pss 37, 49, and 73, stressing the illuminating fact that the writer of Ps 49 is almost alone among Hebrew thinkers in placing a comparatively low value on material prosperity. Striedl has a brilliant exposition of the literary character of the Book of Esther, in which he shows how its grammar is that of a scholarly Jew who is deliberately adopting an archaistic style, and adds a fine appreciation of his quality as a story-teller—we might almost say, as a novelist. Dornseiff continues the application of his classical scholarship to the Old Testament, and, among other points, makes some interesting remarks on the evidence to be gathered from the Balaam story as to early history in the eastern Mediterranean. Several articles deal with philological matters; G. R. Driver, for example, has more to say about the meaning of *nephesh*, and adds some notes on suggestions made by Junker in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*. D. W. Thomas has an important note on a possible meaning of the Hebrew word *shanah*, especially in Pr 5<sup>9</sup> and Is 11<sup>14</sup>, while Köhler continues his special investigation of the meanings of Hebrew words. Some of the fourteen cases with which he deals are especially interesting and important. Hempel himself devotes some pages to a discussion of papyrus fragments of the Greek Deuteronomy, dating from the second century B.C., and draws from them the justifiable conclusion that the text of the LXX as we now have it is, in the main, reliable. We also have an identification of some fragments of a lost work by Philo, the *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum*, from the pen of Früchtel, who has been able to assign to their proper places notes that defeated even Rendel Harris. Finally, special mention may be made of the brief accounts given of articles dealing with the Old Testament which have appeared in a very large number of periodicals since the last issue of the ZAW. It is no disparagement of the original contributions which this journal contains to say that in this feature we have something which is indispensable to every serious student of the Old Testament.

While it may be taken for granted that the best examples of the work being done to-day on the Old Testament will find expression in the ZAW itself, there remains an enormous mass of material which requires just the kind of sifting and presentation which Hempel and his colleagues give us with such unwearied diligence.

In a recent issue of the ZAW Professor Volz put forward a plea for a genuinely scientific and systematic approach to the problems of textual criticism in the Old Testament, together with some practical suggestions. These included the intensive study of different portions of the field by different scholars, and, as if in response to this appeal, Dr. Martin Rehm has published his investigations into the text of the parallel passages in 2 S and 1 and 2 K on the one hand, and 1 and 2 Ch on the other.<sup>1</sup> The greater part of the work is devoted to a study of the relation between the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint in the two books. This is important, not only for the light it throws on the particular books studied, but for its contribution to the general question of the value of the LXX for the restoration of the original text, and for its illustration of the kind of error that has crept into the Hebrew text from time to time. Thus (though Dr. Rehm does not emphasize this point) the list of variations involving different consonants shows that the changes were made for the most part after the adoption of the square character, not through confusions in the older forms of the letters. There is also a judicious summary of the textual relations between the two books. The whole work has been done with that meticulous thoroughness which we have learnt to expect from Catholic scholars in Germany, and the only regret the reader will have is that Dr. Rehm did not append a short chapter summarizing his conclusions.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

<sup>1</sup> *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik*, von Dr. Theol. Martin Rehm (Aschendorfsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster; R.M.7-50).

## Old Texts in Modern Translations.

### Luke xxiv. 35 (Moffatt).

BY THE REVEREND JAMES REID, D.D., EASTBOURNE.

'THEY related their own experience.' The lovely story of the walk to Emmaus tells of one of the ways in which the Risen Christ made Himself known to His followers. He joined two of them as a stranger when they were going home from Jerusalem where they had seen Him crucified. The story shines with the radiance of a real experience. These disciples had been so broken in spirit, so utterly cast down, that nothing short of a meeting with Christ could have restored their faith, and sent them back post-haste to the other disciples to tell them about it. And this is how they brought home to the rest the conviction that Christ had risen. They described what had happened to themselves. The A.V. says: 'They told what things were done in the way.' And Dr. Moffatt translates it: 'They related their own experience.'

They would never have got the truth of the Resurrection home in any other way. If they had said that they had heard a rumour that Christ had risen, no one would have believed them. They were too far gone in despair. The thing was too incredible. Certainly no one would have been convinced. The cloud that hung over their hearts would never have been lifted. As it was, it took a little time for the truth to get through, and for the disciples to become adjusted to this amazing fact; for it meant a sort of revolution in their minds. But the story of these two men did carry conviction, because it was something that had actually happened to themselves. They had seen the Risen Christ. Their hearts had kindled into a blaze of love and faith. Their very faces shone with the glow of it. There was no mistaking that they were talking of something real; and so their story got home and the news thrilled its way from heart to heart, because it was the story of an experience.

There is all the difference between a theory and an experience. Theory may interest us, but it does not carry conviction. A man may tell us something that is true, which he has thought out or read in a book; and what he says may be interesting though we may feel there is something lacking. But when the expert begins to talk, the man who has had first-hand experience, there is a different feel about it. He knows. He has tried the thing out. He has been there.

The value and the power of the New Testament is that it is a statement of experience. It is more than that of course. It contains certain deductions from experience; but it is all based on the facts of experience. The people who wrote the Gospels were not mere biographers, writing up a story from what others had told them about Jesus. They were all people who had had experience of Christ. Some of them had known Him in the flesh and were writing down what they had known and felt about Him, the effect He had had on their lives and their hearts. The First Epistle of John begins: 'That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life, that declare we unto you.' They were telling their experience. But even if some of them had not known Christ so intimately in the flesh, they had all had experience of His power in their hearts and lives. They had all been thrilled and captured by His love. They had all been changed by His grace and goodness. They had all known the touch of His Spirit in the depth of their souls. That which He came to do for men had been done in them. The result was that their words about Him, their descriptions of Him, their picture of Him as He walked and talked in Galilee, and hung on the Cross and then rose from the dead, have the quality of a first-hand experience. They could write about Him as Saviour because He had saved them. They could reveal Him as Lord because He had won their hearts and awakened their worship. When they wrote the Gospels they were relating their own experience.

It is the same with the Apostle Paul. Some people think of him only as a theological theorist, spinning doctrines out of his big brain, some of which are very difficult to understand, and which have very little relation to ordinary life. But there was hardly a word that Paul said that was not based on experience. His own life has been changed by meeting with Christ. The story of it he was never tired of telling. There is no getting away from it. When he speaks of Christ, he is speaking of One he has known and knows. When he tells of Christ's power to save, he is relating an experience, for Christ had saved him. That experience, like a melody in a great symphony, underlies all his theology, every now and again breaking through with the simple joy of it.



When he speaks of Christ's death and resurrection, he does not tell the story like one quoting from a book, or repeating a bit of ancient history. He is telling of an experience. For the Cross had been a power in his own life, slaying the old proud self-righteous self; and the Risen Christ had raised him from the grave of despair into which he had sunk, and had called him forth to live through Him in newness of life. Even in what we call his theology, he is relating an experience.

That is what the Bible gives us all the time—a record of experience. It is not a book of theories or essays about religion. We have plenty of these and they can be interesting enough. But the Bible is different. That is why it can be trusted, and will never lose its interest. 'He hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son.' That is experience: the thing had actually happened. 'One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.' That is the accent of the New Testament. It is experience. It tells of a power in Christ which was actually at work and which remains to be explored and used, as men have explored and used the powers of electricity since first the discovery broke upon the world. We can explain it as we like, but we cannot explain it away. For these changed lives are facts. These new natures are facts. These deliverances from sin are facts. These new powers, coming into the hearts of simple men and women and remaking them, are facts. 'They related their own experience.'

What was the nature of that experience which the two disciples described? It was not merely of the eyes, as of one watching a ship at sea or a man on the street. It was an experience of the soul, as of one watching a sunrise. For something had happened to them and in them that day on the Emmaus road. They had been in touch with the spirit of Christ in this man who was a stranger. There is no other way of becoming aware of Christ as a reality, than through contact with His Spirit, kindling conscience, and bringing strength and healing and peace. Only what is of the spirit, only truth and love and goodness, can be a reality to our spirits, and can make us aware of Christ.

That contact with His Spirit brought them two things as they and the stranger went together along the road. For one thing, a new light broke into their minds. They saw the world as the sphere of God's purpose. They realized that God is a living God, and that life has a meaning and a plan. The drama of the Cross, which had seemed senseless tragedy, was all in God's purpose, and had been turned into

victory. That illumination of the meaning of life and of history is part of the work of Christ. He gives us faith in God, and assures us that life has a meaning, and that His loving purpose is behind it all. There is nothing more important for us in these days than just that—to recover faith in the ultimate meaning of life with all it holds of suffering and evil, and to see this world of ours as the sphere of God's purpose of love. Many people to-day are losing heart because they are losing faith in life and its meaning. That is what Christ can restore.

But this experience did more than illumine their minds. It brought into their hearts a new hope, a new courage, a new peace, a new love. It reinforced their personalities, changing them from the mood of utter despair to faith, and from discouragement to the assurance of triumph. 'Did not our heart burn within us,' they said, 'while he talked with us by the way?'

It is this experience which it is the work of Christ to reproduce. The Christian life is the life that comes out of and is inspired by it. It is the same experience as that which came to these two disciples. It is the awareness of a Presence in our life with whom we are in touch. That is the meaning of what we call the living Christ. We are living to-day in the age of the Resurrection, the new age that began when Christ came into the world and lived and died and rose again. We celebrate this fact every Easter day. But it is the fact that the Christian Sunday was instituted to celebrate. 'This day my Saviour rose.' Every day for a Christian man is Easter day. Every morning is Easter morning. The world in which we live is a world that is different because Christ lives in it, and is waiting to meet us along the roads of defeat or helplessness, where we often walk with downcast hearts because we think the world is empty of God. In every crisis of decision, in every opportunity, in every challenge, He is offering Himself to us, seeking to make touch with us and to awaken our faith and obedience.

The experience of Christ is that of a new power at work within us, lighting up our minds, giving us new heart for life, making us strong to overcome trouble and temptation, and filling our hearts with love and devotion to Himself. That means that the Resurrection is not only a fact of history: it is a spiritual experience. It is the experience of a new life quickened and inspired by Him, a new love, a victorious power through which in us He lives and triumphs. A Chinese magistrate who was converted describes his experience thus: 'When Lazarus came from the dead I don't know what change took

place, but I am perfectly sure I have risen from the dead, because my body, mind, and soul have a new strength as real as if an invisible companion were constantly beside me.' That is exactly what happened to these men, and it is the Christian experience. The events of Christ's life in Palestine become experiences of the soul. As an old mystic puts it :

Though Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem were born,

If He's not born in thee, thy soul is yet forlorn.

Christ rose not from the dead ; Christ still is in the grave,

If thou for whom He died art still of sin the slave.

The Christian experience is not a theory about Christ, not knowledge about Him, not merely the convictions which He awakens, though these are vital. It is this also—a new spirit, a new victory over the world that springs from these convictions rooted in the heart and rising into the flower and fragrance of a new life.

This experience has the power to interest people and to bring conviction. It is in this way most of all that Christianity is spread. The Church grows like every other living organism, by the propagation of its own life. True preaching is, in its essence, the witness to an experience. Whether it be explicit or no, there must be the consciousness that we are relating our own experience. Mere teaching will never spread the gospel. Though the story is essential, merely telling the story of Christ, unless it has kindled our own hearts, will not do it. We must tell that story with the accents of those who have been there with Christ in Galilee, and at the Empty Tomb, and in the Upper Room where He appeared. It is telling that story with the note of experience, the glow in the heart that He has kindled which makes Christ real. There is a proverb that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory. That is true about living Christianity. But it is true also about the spread of the gospel. An ounce of experience is worth a ton of theology. 'Preachers,' says Mr. Hugh Redwood, speaking of his youthful days at church services, 'put forward their theories and elaborate their codes, but they rarely spoke of personal experiment. They rarely told you, for instance, that they knew of God's power to break a man of bad habits because He had broken bad habits for them. And that is the very thing people would have been interested to know.' An audience will hold their breath for a moment when a speaker begins to tell some experience of his own. It may be very simple and very

elementary. But when we can tell some one how God has met us, or how His power came into our own life, or how it was that Christ became a reality to us—that gets home. There is something in that witness that gets through closed doors, and finds its way straight into the heart.

Is not this the reason why the spread of Christianity is so slow to-day ? There are so few Christian people passing on their own experience. It was in this way that Christianity spread in the early days. 'The disciples went everywhere preaching the word.' And preaching the word meant relating their own experience. Why do *we* not spread it and pass it on ? Is it reserve ? Or do we shrink from doing anything that might suggest to other people that we think we are better than they ? We all dislike a prig ; and to talk down to people from a superior height is a form of spiritual pride that every healthy-minded man detests.

But these disciples never said to people or conveyed to them the impression that they thought themselves superior. They made no claim to a goodness of their own. Paul and Peter must often have humbled themselves to the dust when they drew back the curtain from the past and told of their own failures. What they did say was something about Christ, not about themselves. They talked about God's power and forgiveness, and the new peace and love which He had brought into their lives. If they claimed the power to stand up to trouble and to conquer temptation and evil habits, it was no credit to them, and they gave Him the glory. It was all His doing, His grace ; and it was that grace and love of God in their own experience of which they spoke. Their message was a kind of mirror in which there was reflected the beauty and majesty of Christ. When Paul had finished talking, it was not Paul his audience saw, but Christ, and Him crucified.

What was more, they wanted to tell of Christ. They burned to pass on the news. Can we imagine a man meeting the Risen Christ when every one thought Him dead, and not spreading the news ? Is this not often the trouble that our experience of God's grace is not deep enough, not decisive enough, not glowing enough, for us to want to pass it on, even in a very simple way ? That is the real root of the lack of interest in the work of Foreign Missions. Thousands of professedly Christian people never take even a languid interest in the subject. They treat it as if it were the hobby of the ultra-pious, instead of the very life-blood of the Church. They may give us reasons if we ask them, perhaps that threadbare and tattered idea that the religions of the



heathen are good enough for them. But the real reason is simply that they are not conscious of anything vital they want to pass on. They have no experience they want to relate. There is no glow in the heart that makes it burn with love for Christ and for people, no radiance that comes from the sense of deliverance, no consciousness of a gift that Christ has brought into their own lives. If Christ has kindled His glory in our own hearts, we will want to send it forth to light up the ancient darkness of the world.

It comes back to this, does it not, that the real need of the world is first of all a need in the Church. We need to recover the spiritual glow. It may be the need of a fresh experience of the love of Christ. We may need to make conscious to ourselves afresh all we owe to Him, for we can become so

familiar with our blessings that we cease to realize them, and the wonder dies out of the heart. Christ lives. That is the fact that made the Church and brought it into being out of the pit of a deadly despair. Because He lives there is open for us in Him the light and the power that the world needs—the light for all its problems, the love that can dissolve our frictions and drive the wheels of our common life. But how can He find contact with the world? Only through us, through the Church, as we go forth to meet Him on the road where He is waiting, like a Stranger, to join Himself to us and make our hearts burn as He talks with us by the way. As we listen to Him with wills alert for obedience, He kindles the glow of faith and love and gratitude which can set other hearts aflame.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Exodus xv. 2: עֵינִי הִמָּרְתָּ יְהוָה

MR. ELLISON surely misses the point. It is not here a question of what sounds more poetic, but of what, in fact, the author wrote. My critic and I may well agree that 'the LORD is my strength and song' is a finer phrase than 'the LORD is my stronghold and *protection*,' but that does not prove that the author wrote it.

The word הִמָּרְתָּ, 'protection,' has, as I showed, good philological support, and that it indeed existed in the Hebrew vocabulary is shown by such proper names as הִמָּרְתָּ of the Old Testament and בעלומר of the Samarian Ostrakon, No. 12.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it is not without significance that LXX here renders σκεπαστής, pointing to knowledge of the verb ὠμρ, 'protect.'<sup>2</sup>

It should be added that עֵינִי, which MT points as if derived from root עוּ, 'be strong,' ought

<sup>1</sup> On the connexion of names with Zimri- with S. Arabian *dh-m-r*, see Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names of the Hammurabi Dynasty*, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> The word ὠμρ, 'protection,' may also be seen in Job 35<sup>10</sup>, וְכִן יִבְרָתָהּ בְּלִילָה; LXX, however, there renders φυλακάς which points to פָּקְדוֹת, cf. Ps 77<sup>5</sup>: φυλακάς=פָּקְדוֹת.

perhaps to be referred in reality to the root עוּ, 'seek refuge' (Is 30<sup>2</sup>, Jer 4<sup>6</sup>, etc.), underlying מָעוֹז and cognate with Arabic *'awadha*. The same interpretation would seemingly obtain also in Is 26<sup>1</sup>, עֵיר עוֹרְלָנוּ יִשְׁעָהּ יִשְׁתָּ חוֹמוֹת וְחָל, where עֵיר must be identical with the familiar מָעוֹז (Is 17<sup>9</sup>), and where the phrasing accords entirely with the words וְיִהְיֶה לִּי יִשְׁעָהּ in our passage.

In general, Mr. Ellison does not appear to appreciate the fact that poetic taste is no scientific criterion, and that, as Gilbert Murray has observed, it is even possible to accept as a poetic translator a rendering one would reject as a scholar. Nor is one necessarily insensible to the poetry of a phrase because one believes that, in point of fact, a given author never wrote it in a given passage.

Of course, I do not claim that הִמָּרְתָּ *must* mean here what I say it means, but Mr. Ellison's argument does not suffice to disprove it.

Finally, I may mention that the identification of הִמָּרְתָּ with the Arabic root *dhamara* has, as I now see, been anticipated by I. Zolli in *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, 1935, p. 290.

THEODOR H. GASTER.

London.



## Entre Nous.

### A Novelist on Noah: A Problem in Method.

This book on *Noah*, by Mr. R. H. Mottram (Rich & Cowan; 5s. net), is a notable addition to a series of biographies which aims at presenting the lives of well-known Biblical figures in a popular form such as will appeal both to laymen without special knowledge of critical matters and to historians and churchmen of all creeds. This account of Noah will certainly be a 'popular' biography: whether it is exactly a biography is another question. But Mr. Mottram is not over-much concerned with this aspect of the matter. He says explicitly that the book is not meant for students, and will not add to exact knowledge. He is out, not to praise the critics, but to rescue Noah from them; for he holds that, with their dismembering tactics and their theories of eponymous heroes, etc., they have pretty nearly disposed of the patriarch altogether, leaving as 'the most certain thing about him that his name was not Noah.'

Yet with all his protestations, Mr. Mottram makes full use of all information available, and he is an adept at suggesting analogies from folklore and recent literature. His own literary style is fascinating—perhaps at times too self-consciously clever—and the first part of the book at least will hold the attention of that large reading public, actively intelligent, but without special critical equipment, for whom it is intended. His method of presentation differs from that of the critics in that it is synthetic rather than analytic. He unites, indeed, memory with imagination, but he claims precedence for what he would regard as a legitimate and even sanctified use of the imagination, and he is not inclined to sift memories with the exactitude of a historian.

In the course of his studies Mr. Mottram has developed a strong affection for Noah. Few characters, according to him, are so convincing. His notoriety is remarkable, especially with the English-speaking people, into whose imagination the Authorized Version has placed him with a success rivalled by no other translation. Mr. Mottram is convinced that the brilliant sarcasm of an Anatole France would have been impossible if he had read the Book of Genesis in English. Whatever the truth of this conjecture, the fact remains that the story of Noah, although it suffered a temporary eclipse in popularity during the machine-

worshipping and comfort-loving nineteenth century, has captured, to a far greater extent than Adam or Abraham or even King David, the hearts of the simplest and least articulate peasants, has penetrated the folklore of all parts of the country, has led working-men to christen their sons by his name, and—last but not least—has provided a toy for the nursery of perennial charm, unrivalled even by the most elaborate models of the building of the Temple or of any other Old Testament occurrence.

Mr. Mottram locates the Flood in Mesopotamia, and regards it, not as a universal, but as a ubiquitous deluge—ubiquitous in the sense that it is one of many stories of a similar character, although distinguished from them by greater moral alertness. The consideration that the Deluge is not universal does not lessen its impressiveness in an age when communications between countries, and even between districts, were practically non-existent, and the locality constituted the world; and the ubiquitousness showed that in the Flood story there is a recollection which concerned all humanity. As regards date, although the author suggests that 'no one would have dared to call him Neolithic to his face,' Noah is placed in the age when only flint and stone instruments were known, the reason for this conclusion being that when so many instructions for the building of the Ark are given by 'a severely technical Almighty'—to quote the author's description—iron or bronze instruments would certainly have been mentioned, had they been in existence.

Noah is not only an actual human being, but a type. He is the first human being, in an age when society is in a state of transition from the nomad to the pastoral and agricultural condition, who seems to have been capable of using his imagination, and looking before and after. He alone, in contrast to the slothful and indifferent dwellers in the plain, with their 'easy-going confidence that the work in hand will get done even if no one does it,' being himself of a more virile stock, and noting signs obvious to those who had eyes to see, could envisage the approaching catastrophe and take measures for escape. He interpreted the coming doom as a judgment from a God of righteousness, who repented Him of having created man, a 'repentance' which Mr. Mottram artistically illustrates by a quotation from Galsworthy's 'Holiday'



and by a comparison with the feeling of an official who by organization and sanitation has made possible the teeming population of an Oriental city, and then wonders despondingly if all his labours have been worth while, when he sees what the inhabitants have made of their security.

So Noah, 'according to all that God commanded him' went about his boat-building. Of which Mr. Mottram uses all his novelist's art to give a most picturesque and delightful account. Far more ambitious than his great follower, Robinson Crusoe, he builds, not indeed a travelling menagerie, but a cattle-boat; for our author, even with all his respect for the use of the imagination, refuses to allow the Ark to contain all the inhabitants of a Whipsnade, being deterred chiefly by the obvious difficulty of watering them when adrift on saltish floods. Noah is a 'man of destiny,' standing out 'even more distinctly over against his fellow-creatures because he does not chatter,' laughing rarely but with gusto, concerned principally to get something practical done, managing his conglomerate company of the Ark (including his wife and daughters-in-law) with consummate ability; and when at last the waters dried from off the face of the earth, getting them all out again safely on dry land by breaking through the covering of the Ark, because the one and only door—which is compared to the kitchen-hatch of a modern passenger liner—had jammed; carrying through the whole enterprise so successfully that the multitude of his descendants which is stated so generously in the Genesis story, may be taken as a delicate compliment to Noah's organizing ability.

What of the moral and religious value of the story, according to Mr. Mottram? He passes slightly over the lapse at the end of the story, which, he holds, shows Noah to have been human and not a demi-god, and which he might have been thankful to the critics for reminding him, is omitted altogether in the more priestly source of the Genesis narrative. He gives us on the whole a convincing picture of a deeply religious man who, in the days when 'the old direct appeal of a deity to a universe completely under his control' was still possible, heard 'the voice of God,' and responded by his native sheer capacity, 'which it is more graceful to call righteousness.' At any rate, we are told in the Bible that 'Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord,' and Mr. Mottram finds evidence of the grace throughout the whole story, especially in Noah's act of sacrifice and worship at the ending of the Flood, and in his discovery—expressed in what our author calls 'one of the most

inspired sentences in the language' and 'the basis of the conception of a reasonable and beneficent Creator who has been the father of the spirit of how many generations of English thought and feeling'—of the significance of the rainbow, with all that it meant as an assurance of God's care 'in seed-time and harvest, while the earth remaineth.' Noah's experience meant an advance in the religious confidence of the race.

#### Repudiating God.

In *The War against God* Mr. Sidney Dark and Mr. R. S. Essex (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net) tell the story of how countries to-day are repudiating God bitterly and systematically—Russia, Germany, Turkey, and Mexico, and it may also be Spain—and how others again are repudiating Him politely. The example they give of this is—England. In their foreword the authors explain the purpose of the book 'It is, therefore, of importance to have accurate knowledge of the reason why God is regarded as the enemy, and for what end He is to be expelled from the world which He created. It seems to us idle folly to shudder at what may be the blasphemies of the unbeliever and to pass by on the other side with cotton-wool in one's ears. We have listened to him as attentively as we can, and have made a careful note of what he has said. That note may have its uses because we find little that is admirable in the habit of men of strong convictions refusing to study the case of their opponents.'

Before coming to the present day a good historical sketch is given of the rise and development of critical thought about God—in the two chapters entitled 'From Job to Machiavelli' and 'From Luther to Comte.' We must not forget to mention also the interesting short summary of the teaching of H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Hardy, and A. E. Housman, J. B. S. Haldane, Middleton Murry, Bertrand Russell, C. E. Joad, and Aldous Huxley. This summary refreshes our memory and gives even well-known facts a new touch which makes their significance clearer.

Even those well informed will be surprised at the cumulative effect on their minds of the facts presented by this book, and will be compelled to ask themselves again and again how far the defects of the Church have contributed to the widespread war against God.

One of the most interesting chapters deals with Mexico. The position in Mexico has developed in a similar way to the position in Russia, Germany, and Spain. It began by anti-clericalism and it



then developed into anti-theism. The Government claims that the former was due to the opposition of the Church to all social and economic progress. When the constitution was reformed the Secretary for Education asserted: 'The public power recovered fully the guidance of childhood and youth, permitting them to create a rational concept of the universe and of the social life, repelling the imposition of all religious doctrine by the instructors, in order to substitute, for fanaticism and social prejudices, scientific truth.'

And this is how 'scientific education' is established. It is a quotation from an official school Reader:

'Mama believes that the strike can be settled by prayers. If the boss knew this, how he would laugh! Then mother "confessed," and told the priest all about the strike. The curate is not in our situation and, as he does not know the indignity of being paid a miserable salary, and since he has never worked with his hands, he counselled my mother, RESIGNATION, and to bear everything in the LOVE of GOD. A beautiful formula. Very convenient. But it did not convince my father.

'If the owner throws you out: "Resign thyself."

'If the boss fires you: "Resign thyself."

'If the boss kills you with hunger: "Resign thyself."

'And all for the love of God, who permits the bosses to exploit the working man. This is all that a man who is called a shepherd of souls and who gives his hand hypocritically to be kissed, could counsel. I am going to find a more practical formula.'

#### More about Canon Sheppard.

We are glad to give in this issue an account of Canon Sheppard's work written by one who knew both it and Canon Sheppard himself intimately. It will be remembered that in the solemn procession from St. Martin's to St. Paul's Cathedral it was Mr. Johnston who walked with Major Sheppard, the Canon's brother, behind the flower-laden hearse. The article appears in our 'Christianity in Action' series, and it is interesting to notice that Mr. Max Plowman, writing in the *St. Martin's Review* for December, strikes the same note. He says, 'The Peace Pledge Union stood to him for Christianity in action. He believed that, irrespective of creed, "by their works ye shall know them."'

'I have never known a Christian less concerned about the articles of his faith; and very certainly I have never known—nor ever hope to know—one

as hourly concerned with the practice of his religion. Only a month or two before he died, I remember his saying to a small company of his closest friends: "When a man has had as much experience as I've had, he gets to know what he can do and what he can't. I know that I can't preach, and I know that I can't write; but I tell you what I'm good at: I'm a good mixer."

Blessed are the good mixers, for they shall prove to be the only practical peacemakers.

The *St. Martin's Review* for December is largely devoted to Dr. Sheppard's life and work, and many will want to get a copy. Attention might also be drawn to *Dick Sheppard and St. Martin's*. This contains a good history of St. Martin's with a chapter on Dr. Sheppard and another on the Reverend Pat McCormick. The author is the Reverend R. J. Northcott of St. Martin's (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). From the appreciations in the *Review* we give three short quotations:

The Archdeacon of Northumberland:

'Whether we were talking sad things or gay things—he was a peerless maker of laughter—or discussing difficult problems, when the moment of leaving came, one closed his door with a pang of regret—always.

'He was unique among all the people that I have met in this also—that in every human situation he was by instinct perfectly Christian—unexpected often, but wonderfully sure and right in his touch compared with well-meaning blunderers such as the rest of us are. This was not merely because he was a gentleman of perfect breeding, but because at bottom he had a Christ-like sensibility of the mood, the mind and the need of the other person.'

The Master of the Temple:

'He was strangely lonely. He seemed to be always giving his heart to every one, but in reality I am sure that he wrestled alone with God, never finding complete fellowship in this world.'

Sheppard, quoted by Middleton Murry:

'Faith? I don't believe I know anything about Faith, Middleton. But Jesus is my God. I don't believe I have any faith except that: but I have a love for men; somewhere in me I have love. I hang on to that.'

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.